

की स्वतंत्रता को नहीं देखना चाहती जिस जवान के लिये कहा जा सकता है कि :

“उजाड़े खानमाँ तूने, विगाड़े खान्दाँ तूने,
वह जन्नत बन गई दोऊख कदम रक्खा जहाँ
तूने।”

उस जवान के जनाजे को जक दम खत्म किया जाय और हिन्दुस्तान में प्रादेशिक भाषाओं को कायम किया जाय। सरकार की यह ड्यूटी है और अगर सरकार ऐसा नहीं करती है तो डिफेन्स आफ इंडिया बिल के मातहत सरकार के खिलाफ कार्रवाई की जाय।

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I confess

to a feeling of a little confusion after the speech of the hon. Member who has just spoken. I hoped and I intend, as far as I could, to deal with the question before this House—

श्री यशपाल सिंह : आज के पवित्र वायु मंडल में प्रधान मंत्री हिन्दी में बोलें तो अच्छा रहे।

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : आज तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री हिन्दी में बोलें तो अच्छा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जायें हर एक मेम्बर को हक है हासिल है कि चाहे वह हिन्दी में बोले या अंग्रेजी में। यह उस की मर्जी है। मैं किसी को इस के लिए कुछ नहीं कर सकता। आप बैठ जायें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जायें।

श्री बागड़ी : गांधी जी की जवान तो बोलें।

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : उत्तराधिकारी तो गांधी जी के हैं।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But the last speech—I am not criticising it, and I am merely saying that I do not quite know what it was about, and I must say with respect that many of the speeches delivered either for the motion or a criticism of it, were—

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं वाक आउट करता हूँ क्योंकि ऐसे हम भाषा के सवाल पर भी प्राइम मिनिस्टर हिन्दी में नहीं बोलते। मैं इस के विरोध में बाहर जाता हूँ।

12.25 hrs.

(Shri Bagri then left the House)

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैं बहुत मशकूर हूँ माननीय सदस्य का अगर वह यहाँ से चले गये।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : उन के जाने का कम से कम एक असर तो हुआ कि आप हिन्दी में दो शब्द बोले।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर, अगर आप भी चाहते हैं।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैं और भी मशकूर हूँगा। (Interruption).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या आप बोलने की इजाजत ही नहीं देंगे किसी को ?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: When we started the course of the Bill, when

in regard to that matter. I do not know—I hope at least—that it has some effect on those who misbehaved on that occasion, because if they really thought about the matter at all, they have done more injury to the cause of Hindi than any man in the whole of India. Now, if this is the logic how some hon. Members act, it is a little difficult to meet their arguments which are equally wide of the mark.

Yesterday, one hon. Member who had not come here but in the precincts of this House behaved in a rather extraordinary manner, I do not know if that gentleman, that hon. Member, has the least conception of what Parliament is, what democracy is, how one is supposed to behave or ought to behave. It is extraordinary where we are going to.

Shri Bade (Khargone): On a point of order, Sir. When the hon. Member is not here and when action has already been taken against him, can he say...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Yes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That, I submit, raises even more deeper questions than even the question of language. Therefore, I am referring to it, because language, after all, does represent some of the deepest urges of the human beings and is the vehicle of all our business. I am perfectly free to say that I will prefer any language, whether Finnish, Swedish or anything, but I am not prepared to have this behaviour in the name of language and spoil democracy and everything.

As I said, many of the speeches—delivered yesterday—some I had the privilege to listen to and some I read subsequently—it seemed to me, having regard to the importance of the occasion and consideration of problems which raise considerable heat and passion, were on the whole, if I

may say so with respect, in spite of the delicacy of the subject and in spite of the strong sentiments expressed, in line with parliamentary practice and procedure and were good for all to listen to, even though we may not have agreed with them. I refer to the speeches like those delivered by Prof. Mukerjee or Dr. Govind Das. Much that Dr. Govind Das said, and indeed part of his speech consisted of quotations from various persons, including quotations from me, one can agree with that and yet, as it happens, thoroughly agree with the conclusion that he has arrived at. Whatever he said, he said because he felt it and I welcome his saying it.

I am sorry I cannot say exactly the same thing about the hon. Member, Mr. Anthony's speech, which I read in full afterwards. It was unhappy. I am not referring to his views. But it was an unhappy speech and as he himself said in the course of his speech, he represented a rather extreme, and I think he used the word 'bigoted' point of view. That is not the way to consider this question. I shall venture to deal with one or two points that have been raised. There are not many points raised; in spite of the heat engendered in the debate, there are not really many points raised, because it is not a contest between English and Hindi. It will be wrong to look at it in that way.

This is a Bill in continuation of what has happened in the past, to remove a restriction which had been placed by the Constitution on the use of English after a certain date, i.e. 1965. It is just to remove that restriction that this was placed. It was to carry out an assurance given in this House; it does not do really much more than that. There are a few other little things, but the main thing is to remove that restriction. It was our purpose to bring this Bill during the last session, but the last session

was tied up with many things, you will remember, with regard to the emergency. It was a short session and we could not do it for lack of time. We were accused then of deliberately not bringing it forward and postponing it. We were accused of doing that by the very persons who want us to postpone it today. I do not understand it. In spite of the heavy work before this House, we insisted in bringing it forward to please the people who thought that we were playing about with this matter and postponing it for various reasons, because we dare not bring it before the House, etc. Now we are asked to postpone it. I am sorry I do not understand the logic behind this demand. This bill is essentially a Bill to extend this period, more or less indefinitely, beyond the period put down in the Constitution—1965. That is the main purpose—there may be differences of language etc.—and I think it should be looked at in that way.

Now, the hon. Member, Shri Anthony has said very hard things about various persons and about the assurance I gave. I am sorry,—I am not, I hope, lacking completely in some kind of mental capacity—I am entirely unable to understand what he has said about going back on any assurance I gave at any time. He talked about all kinds of pressures being exercised on me. I do not know who is exercising it. I am not aware of it, and I have not succumbed to any pressure either exercised or implied. I had given on the last occasion an assurance about no major change being made in regard to the use of English without the consent, without the approval of the non-Hindi-speaking people. That was made by me and that represents not only my view point but the view point of our Government. And, when it was made, it was clear to me that it was made, largely with the approval of this House. We stand by that completely. There is not an iota of difference from what we had said then. And, apart

from that, what I may have said or not said, there are circumstances in the country which inevitably point to that direction. May be, some of these gentlemen who perform *havans*, and what not, on this question may think otherwise. That is a different matter. May be, Shri Anthony in his excitement may also think otherwise. I would strongly recommend Shri Anthony to develop close contacts with the gentleman who is performing the *havan* outside and, perhaps...

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Sir, I rise on a point of explanation. May I know—I am not questioning the motives of the Prime Minister—how the Bill reflects his assurance? How are the non-Hindi-speaking people going to be consulted? How is "may" going to be prevented from being interpreted as "may not"?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I shall deal with those points. I do not see how this Bill was going to say anything about the consultation of non-Hindi-speaking people.

Shri Frank Anthony: Why not?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I say, according to my thinking, it is quite absurd and un-constitutional.

Shri Frank Anthony: Why is it un-constitutional? Give us some reasons. I am a lawyer and the Prime Ministered also is. Why is it un-constitutional?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The assurance has nothing to do with the Bill or the Act being passed in this Parliament by the vote only of one part of the Parliament. The whole thing seems to be absurd on the face of it, limiting the power of Parliament, limiting the power of Assemblies and other bodies in that way. It is an assurance which has to be given effect to in other ways. For the Government to see to it that nothing is done against it, for the Government when the time comes to consult the State

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

legislatures also, I can understand. But to say in this House we give an assurance that a future legislation will have to be passed by only one half, or whatever the figure is,—it may be two-third—and others should not vote, seems to be quite extraordinary (*Interruption*).

As for the words "may" and "shall" — would again say that when people get excited they do not see quite straight—the word "may" is the most ordinary word always used in this connection in the English language. I do not pretend to know more English than Shri Anthony. But the question is of removing a restriction, a restriction which would have prevented the English language to be used after a certain date. We say, for removing it, that this may be used afterwards. It is quite absurd to say that the word "may" means also "may not".

Shri Frank Anthony: Why absurd? That is the natural meaning.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May be, but I disagree with the hon. Member.

Shri Frank Anthony: If you disagree with the natural meaning, what can I do?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I disagree with the hon. Member in this context. I say it is not the natural meaning in this context. The dictionary meaning may or may not be so but, in this context, it simply means that the barrier is removed, and I defy, I challenge anybody to prove that this Bill does not remove that limitation and barrier. That is the main purpose of this Bill.

Now, let us consider this matter with some objectivity and calmness. I realise, it is very difficult to do so when people get excited about it. It may be because of my upbringing but I am rather partial to English. I think English is a fine language, just as other

languages are very fine too. Nevertheless, I have been convinced for a long long time, and I am convinced today, that any real upsurge in India from the people, any awakening of the people, cannot take place through the English language; it is patent to me; not today, but for the last 40 to 50 years, ever since I have been engaged in public work in this country. The House will remember, at least many of the hon. Members who have participated in it will remember, the tremendous difference that came in our public work and agitational work when we gave up frock coat, top hat and English language in our approach to the people. There was an amazing difference. Previously, we talked in the English language, even in our Congress sessions and other meetings, but we could not reach the people. It is obvious, and it does not seem to be an arguable point that a country can preserve not only its individuality but develop the sense of the masses only through languages which have some deep roots in their minds and hearts. Therefore, from that time onwards, I have believed that it is through the languages of India alone that we could do it. That has nothing to do with our discarding English, because I think it is a very important language and, I think, in some form or other—it is not a question of ten years or not—English is likely to remain in India for a long long time. I repeat it. I do not know the exact form it will take, whether for international use or otherwise, but the mere fact of its being there will serve as a vitaliser to our language, though it is a curious argument that I am using.

Our languages are fine languages and old languages. I do not know who, I forget the name, somebody, probably Shri Anthony, said they are 50 years old. I was amazed to hear that.

Shri Frank Anthony: I did not say that, I quoted Shri Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, who said that what is now being passed off as Hindi came here

as a dialect only in 1860. I never presumed to say that. That is what Shri Suniti Kumar Chatterjee says.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Our languages, most of them, certainly the big languages, Bengali, Gujarati, Marathi etc. and the Southern languages of Tamil, Telugu, Kannada and Malayalam are great languages from any point of view. They have produced great books, which are rooted down in the minds of the people. There is no doubt about that.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy (Koppal): Even before Christ.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as Tamil is concerned, if I may say so, it is as old as Sanskrit, and all our languages, Northern languages, apart from the four Southern languages, are all daughters of Sanskrit. The other languages also, to some extent, have grown from that root and have been closely associated and affected by Sanskrit. In fact, one may say with confidence that Sanskrit has represented broadly all the thought, culture and traditions of India; I do not say exclusively, but broadly it may be said so. I am an admirer of Sanskrit; not that I know very much, but I admire it very greatly.

I thought that it would be a great pity if Sanskrit became a completely dead language in India at any time. That would be a great damage done to all that we stand for in India. Unfortunately, we cannot make Sanskrit the working language in India today. That is obvious. I should like to encourage the learning of Sanskrit as widely as possible, but it cannot become the language of the common people. It ceased to be a language of the common people 2,000 years ago when Prakrits came in. It remained a language of the learned and gradually Prakrits developed. But it gives a certain basis and foundation for our present day languages, strengthens them, gives them depth and so on which we should cherish.

If we had only two or three languages, I would have suggested—suppose, there were three languages—that all the three languages should be national languages in the sense that all three should be used as they use three languages in Switzerland or as they use some languages in Finland or in Canada. In Finland about 10 per cent of the population is Swedish but Swedish is also a national language in addition to Finnish because the 10 per cent are there.

In these matters of language one has to be very careful. One has to be as liberal as possible. One should not try to suppress a language. One should not try to coerce anybody into a language as far as possible. Wherever an attempt has been made to suppress a language, a popular language, or coerce the people into some other language there has been trouble. There have been innumerable examples of this. Therefore since it is impossible for us to have 13 or 14 languages mentioned in our Constitution as languages which everyone should know and use daily, nevertheless the makers of our Constitution were wise in laying down that all the 13 or 14 languages were our languages as much as any other. There is no question of any one language being more a national language than any other. I want to make that perfectly clear. Bengali or Tamil is as much an Indian national language as Hindi. Therefore it becomes our duty to encourage the 13 or 14 languages.

But having admitted that may I differ completely from the remark that many hon. Members have made here—and the hon. Member who spoke last repeated it many times—about Hindi being not allowed to grow and not encouraged etc.? I entirely disagree with that. I think, Hindi has grown more in the last 15 years. Not only Hindi but all our Indian languages have grown more in the last 15 years than any language anywhere in the world in this course of time. It is a big thing, I say. But I say that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

with some knowledge and confidence because I happen to be the President of the Sahitya Akademi which deals with all these languages. I see what is being done in all these languages. Reports come to me. Hundreds and thousands of books have been produced in all these languages, including Hindi of course, by the Sahitya Akademi. Hundreds of translations from one into the other have been done. All our languages are alive and are dynamic today. People seem to imagine that the growth of a language is whether it is used by some wretched clerk in some wretched office or not as if that represents the life of a language. It is a part of the use of the language; certainly, it should be used, but no clerks and no departments and Government offices have ever made a language grow.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: (Hoshangabad): Why wretched clerks?

An Hon. Member: Wretched Ministers.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Languages grow because of other reasons. What has happened to our languages? In spite of our fine old literature, in spite of some magnificent books, the fact remains that our languages have ceased to grow. They have become static because they did not wholly represent life as it is lived today and the modern trends of thought. They represent our traditions. In the 19th Century our languages had to face English, not directly. English came in—not with our goodwill, but it came in—and because English came in, English became a vehicle of new ideas about the new world, not only of science and technology—that of course, but many other things too. It is the impact of English on our languages that has made them grow from the 19th century onwards. Even the literary forms of our languages changed greatly. They are very very few—prose works, very fine poetical words, epics in our languages, prose works of 19th cen-

tury creation in our languages, fine prose works as they came. So, because of the impact of English on our languages, our languages grow and I do submit that even now, although they have grown and they will grow, the further impact of English on our languages will be good for our languages. From the limited point of view, for the growth of our languages alone, it is good for them to be in contact with foreign languages. I say, foreign languages. They can be in contact with Russian, with French, with German, with Italian, with Spanish, etc. But the fact is that the easiest contact for us is through the English language. Therefore I would submit that for the growth of our languages and making them more and more dynamic in responding to the world's needs today, it is necessary for these contacts to be established and encouraged. I venture to say that because hardly anybody realises the effect of these contacts. I think one of the most harmful things that has happened in India, not in regard to language only but including language and affecting our whole lives is that we have lived for hundreds of years in the past, regardless of who was a ruler here—so-called Hindu times, so-called Muslim times—in closed circle, had very little contacts with outside world, earlier, long ago.

Shri Hem Barua: That is true only of the medieval times.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In the early days of this era, India was not so cut off from the rest of the world. Of course, in the Buddhist times, India had wide contacts, people went all over, people came here—literary and everything. But gradually about a thousand years ago, India became more and more self-centred, may be because we are introspect people—that helped us—but anyhow we became self-centred and we lost these contacts. We could not keep pace and we did not even know what happened in the world outside and that affected our languages too because the language is a very good medium of

what the people are and our languages became static, not progressive, not developing, because our lives were static. And it was the changes that came with the British invasion of India which administered the shock and all that which had this effect on our languages also. It made them more dynamic—brought new forms, brought the novel, brought short stories, brought so many things, brought new kind of drama quite apart from science and technology which is a good thing.

Now, at the present moment, anyhow, we have to face a situation in India and realise that India is a multi-lingual country. We must realise that. What is the good of hon. Members opposite talking about 44 crores of people knowing Hindi? It is not a fact. Everybody knows it. India is a multi-lingual country although the languages in use in India, especially in north India are closely alike through Sanskrit and the languages of the south are not so closely alike but nevertheless they have many contacts through Sanskrit. That is the first fact to be realised. And the second is that we have to develop this country through the languages of the people. There is no other way. You may have English—you may like, I hope, to have English too—but the language, the real language to develop people is through their own language which they understand, to which they have emotional response. I would go so far as to say. I am all for English being used for higher scientific and technological studies—English or the foreign language. But, I think, even to spread the knowledge of science in our schools, we must teach it widely through the national languages. Because, otherwise, you will inevitably limit the people's appreciation of it, people understanding of it. It will not spread. In the higher stages foreign languages will come in; in research work, etc.: not one, but several foreign languages will come in.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpur): The Vice-Chancellors do not agree. That is the trouble.

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimali): They have agreed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Let us not look at it from the point of view of Hindi versus English or English versus Hindi. That is a wrong point of view. We have to use each in its proper sphere. In the sphere of national language, only national languages have any place. All the fourteen national languages have a place. There is no doubt about that. You cannot speak of English in that connect. You can speak of English in many connections. You can say as I do say that English should be a compulsory language in the schools, second language, foreign language; that is a different matter; that English should be used for foreign contacts, that English should be used for scientific and technological work of a higher grade and all that. That is all right. But, English cannot be, we must admit it, a language which rouses the understanding or emotion of the common people in India. They must be the languages of India, whether it is Tamil, Hindi, Bengali or Marathi.

I would add that all these languages of India have made remarkable progress in the last 15 years. Some, of course, have made it before too. But, they have now made remarkable progress. I entirely deny, repudiate the suggestion that these languages have not progressed. You may criticise some Government activities. They might have helped more. I do submit you are thinking entirely in terms of offices and clerks. Language is something bigger than offices and clerks. I will tell you an instance. Take Urdu. I think it may broadly be said that no great encouragement has been given to Urdu and yet, such is the vitality of Urdu that today, Urdu is growing faster than many of the other national languages of India. If you judge of it from the number of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

books that are published,—that is a good test—books, dramas, stories and other literary books, it is extraordinary how fast Urdu has grown. Because, it is a dynamic language. I think that if Hindi is really to grow very fast, it should ally itself with Urdu, ally itself in the sense of vocabulary, etc. It will get vitality from Urdu retaining its own genius and nature. Urdu is vital. I shall tell you why. For many reasons, because, Urdu has a strange capacity of adaptability and of drawing from other languages. Urdu has drawn more from English than Hindi, strictly speaking. Urdu has drawn from Persian, Urdu has drawn from Arabic, Urdu has drawn from the Turki language in Central Asia. It can do that. I do not mean to say that you should adapt from Arabic or Turki in Hindi. That is not my point. It is this adaptability that makes a language strong. The other thing weakens it. The tendency which, unfortunately, has been evidenced in India for some time of living in a narrow linguistic circle and coining words from ancient Sanskrit or Pali, I do not know, does not help. Because those words which you coined have no reality behind them, have no emotion, have no history. Every word, if you look up in the dictionary, has got a history behind it. It is an impossibility for you to really translate from one language to another. Because, you cannot translate all the historic connections of that word, where it has been used, how it has been used. That is so in regard to the best of all languages. You may translate, of course, a chair or table. Something like that you can translate. But, as soon as you get a slightly more complicated idea, you cannot translate it. You may represent that idea. Of course, once you get into the question of translating into or from Chinese, it is almost an utter impossibility to do it. Because, the whole background of the Chinese language is quite different. It is not even an alphabetical

language. It is a picture language, or whatever it is. That apart, we do not have to face that difficulty in translating from Hindi to English or any other European languages because the basic stock is the same, historical development, etc. Yet, it is extremely difficult to translate from one language to another. As one who has tried it, I am amazed at the rapidity with which our journalists translate, seldom correctly. But, they do. They pass off some journalese starting off which I rather doubt if it would benefit the growth of our national languages. This is a new development.

We have to develop our regional languages. There is no doubt about that. I am putting for the moment Hindi as a regional language only. We have to do everything. I have no doubt that they will do more and more of the work, education, administration, etc., in the regional languages.

The real difficulty arises in the next stage. What is the link connecting these regional languages? That is the point we are dealing with. Thus far, the link has been English. In fact, not only the link, but work has been done not in the regional languages, but in English even in the regions. What are we to do? That is not a question of your choice or mine. It is partly, of course.

We all know that English standards are going down; not because of conflict between Hindi and English, but because of conflict between the rising regional languages and English. English standards are going down. They will go down. I think English would be more widely known in India in the future than even now. But, it will not be better known in quality. Individuals apart, you won't have people as we have had in the past, who took pride in their English quite so much. As Shri H. N. Mukerjee said, we have had a fixation about English and we still have it to a large extent. There is no doubt there is a certain vested interest created in the knowledge of English. It is a bad thing to have a

fixation. It is a bad thing to have a vested interest. Because, that automatically separates us from those who do not know English. It is a very bad thing. We know before independence what the position was. In this country of castes, the most hardened caste was the caste of English knowing people, English clothed, English living, English knowing people. A terrible caste. All our administrators and others, many of us too belonged to that caste. It is a bad thing because it put tremendous barriers between us and the masses of India. We gave it up; many of us gave it up. I do not attach much importance to clothing. But, it is important that it removes the barriers. We gave it up and we took to wearing clothes which were more in keeping with the Indian people. That brought us nearer to them. It is quite clear, if I go in European clothes to a village, I am further removed from them than otherwise. As it is, I am far enough from them in many ways. But, I am further removed from them if I go like that. If I go and speak to them in English, I can satisfy myself; I won't satisfy anybody else. That is patent. We have to remove these barriers that have come between us and our people. The great success of Gandhiji's movement was that we removed many of these barriers. That process has not stopped.

All that is admitted. It follows logically that we can only progress in our national languages. National languages mean all the languages mentioned in the Schedule to the Constitution. We cannot, I would add, suppress any of them; we cannot impose any of them on others—both these things. Because, imposition in the sense of imposition is resisted and it is harmful to the thing being imposed. Other languages come up and they fight with each other. The growth of India in the language sense can only take place by the co-operation of languages and not by conflict of languages. They are near enough. I was talking about translation. It is rela-

tively easy to translate from one Indian language to another, because, the ideas behind them are much the same and the language is not so terribly difficult. We can do that. So, we have to take all the languages together. The only question that remains is—there are many questions, and one of them is—the link language between them. And Hindi has been suggested by our Constitution as the link language for Central and official purposes. Remember the words "Central and official purposes."

13 hrs.

It is clear that if we do not think of English as such a link language for any length of time, then inevitably we have to deal with Hindi, not because Hindi is superior to Bengali or Marathi or Tamil—of course, not; nobody says that; in some matters it may be better; in some matters, it may not be—but for the simple reason that Hindi is the most feasible for this purpose, apart from its being widespread; and it is spreading. If may say so, all the steps that my hon. friend the Education Minister may take in regard to the spread of Hindi do not go as far as the effect of the cinema on the spread of Hindi. These are patent things. This is what is happening. This is life as it is. These are recognised things. And any order that in this office Hindi must be used tomorrow—I have no objection to that, but that—does not spread Hindi to the root of it. The cinema does more than all these orders, so that we can envisage or have a link language which is Hindi and no other, that is, if it is not English. I submit that we cannot have English in any sense for a long time.

I said some time ago that I want English to continue here for many purposes, and I hope it will continue and to some extent, it may even be a link language between thinkers and authors, individual thinkers, literary people and even governmental people—

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I have no objection—but the normal link language cannot be English.

Therefore, the normal link language has to be an Indian language, and of all the Indian languages, only Hindi is feasible. That is the only claim that I make for it. Because of this, it was decided in our Constituent Assembly, and wisely decided, that Hindi should be the official language for Central purposes.

- Now, it is said that it might have become, but I think that most people agree that at the present moment, it will not serve the purpose fully to take up all this work of the administration. But they say that this is because the Government has not helped it or not encouraged it enough. There may be some justification. I do not think that there is much in regard to Government not helping it, but the reasons are far deeper than Government help or lack of help. People seem to think that a language is a thing which grows or spreads by some magic like the mango tree covered up and which grows up. It is a much deeper thing than that. Especially when there is a question of one language people rubbing up the people of another language, it becomes still more difficult. You have to proceed very cautiously. It is not a question of producing only dictionaries, although dictionaries have to be produced and have been produced and will be produced, all glossaries of terms and other things. It is something much bigger than that.

A language must develop the thinking habits of the subject with which it is concerned. You can write books, and translations are being made of technical books, and that is right, simple books, but the moment you go a little beyond that your translations are stilted; they have no history behind them; the words used have no history behind them. Here, you have a tremendous history which is contemporaneous for the growth of

science and technology, out of which each word has come. Now, if you translate it quickly into some word which has had no previous history, and no previous life in it, it becomes a stilted word. So, all these things come in the way.

That is why it has been suggested, and, I think, accepted, that all scientific and technical terms should as far as possible be in line with international usage, not only in Hindi but in all the languages of India. And if you do that, if all the languages of India adopt scientific and technical words in conformity with international usage, you succeed in two things; first of all, you bring the languages of India closer to each other. Secondly, you keep contacts with the thought of the world in regard to technical and scientific matters. They are both important. And it becomes easy for you to learn another language for scientific work etc. All this is happening daily. And to say that Hindi has not progressed is merely to show an utter and absolute ignorance of the subject. Hindi has progressed; Bengali has progressed, and Tamil has progressed and so on. I am surprised at the abundance—I am not concerned very much with text-books, although they are important, but really—of the matter coming out in all our languages, which represents new thought and a new approach to our problems. That is the growth of a language, and that is happening.

So, I submit that there is no escape for us; you may argue; you may have your preferences as you like; but there is no escape for us from these three or four languages.

India is a multilingual country. Although it is multilingual, the languages are closely allied, and, therefore, they are not foreign to each other. That is, you can skip from one to another with relative ease, and we should try to do so. We have suggested the three-language formula. A larger number of people should know, some other languages apart from English, some other Indian languages,

that is, other than their own. And as this grows, you will find them coming closer together, a large number of people knowing the other languages and the gaps which exist today between Indian languages will lessen. But, inevitably, those languages must grow in their own regions. That should be encouraged.

The question of the link language remains, and there can be no other link language than Hindi basically. But merely saying it or putting it down in the Constitution does not make it the link language. It has to grow into it. It is not sufficiently adapted today for various reasons. It is getting rapidly adapted. Let it be adapted, and let us encourage that process. And while that process is being encouraged, it becomes necessary and almost inevitable for English to continue to be a link language. The process is not a sudden thing that you fix a date and from that date you say that English ceases and Hindi comes in. It is a gradual process of both being link languages, and Hindi gradually getting better and better known and better and better used, and in regard to English, as is happening today, and as I said, the standards are going down, and the use will go down to some extent, although it will be more widespread. That is the process I see.

And in this gradual transformation, dates have very little significance except to see what happens, except to examine the position from time to time to see what is happening, to see whether we are going along the right lines or not. It is important that we should see and give a certain direction to our movements.

Now, from that point of view, it becomes, and it is quite inevitable, according to me, apart from the assurances I gave or I may have given, that English has to continue as an associate language or an additional language or call it what you like.

These words have no particular meaning. The door remains open, and it will be used. As a matter of fact, it is the circumstances prevailing in the country that will compel you to use it. They do compel you to use it, and not what you call it. And if you try to suppress its use, undoubtedly, you create not only a hiatus and a gap but you do stop or progress in many directions, because that progress cannot be achieved at the present moment entirely through Hindi.

Therefore, the whole object of this Bill is to remove that barrier which was put by the Constitution, that barrier of date and to allow things as they are to continue. For how long they will continue, I think, is a matter which I cannot precisely and definitely say. But our progress should be in these various directions, in developing our regional languages, in developing Hindi also, not only as a regional language, but as a link language, as far as possible, and maintaining English to serve that purpose so that there may be no hiatus or gap. And gradually this process will automatically take shape. Regardless of governmental decisions, these are the forces at work. This is bound to happen. It is happening. You may expedite it or you may slow it down a little. That is a possibility. But I do think we should get rid of English, which, I think, is very good, very useful, but of the fixation of the English language in our minds. I think that is bad, because that separates us from the rest of our people.

There is one thing else. I think the Home Minister said or may say later that whenever that Committee, which is envisaged in this, after ten years is constituted and reports, that report should—we entirely agree—be sent to all the State Governments for their views, so that there is no question of rushing a thing like this. There is no

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

question of trying to impose anything on others in this way, because the attempt will fail. The more you impose, the more obstructions you have, the more difficulties you have. A question like this can only be dealt with by a large measure of consent and consultation.

Shri Frank Anthony: May I very respectfully ask one thing? On this clause 5 I raised this very question. When the report of the Parliamentary Committee was discussed here, I sought to move an amendment. The Speaker said that Parliament had no authority to change that Report by one syllable. What is the good of bringing it here and sending it on to the States? You short-circuit Parliament. We cannot change it by one syllable. That is what we are asking for.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what happened then. But I do not see how you can change a Report. A Report is a Report.

Shri Frank Anthony: Why should not the recommendations be of Parliament? It is a Parliamentary Committee. Why should not Parliament make the recommendations?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Parliament may make independent recommendations. It can always do that. But it cannot change the Report of other people.

Shri Frank Anthony: We always consider reports. It can consider the Report and make recommendations.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): May I ask another question? The Prime Minister has just said that the Report of the Committee which would be appointed after ten years would be sent to all the States for their opinions and general concurrence.

Shri Frank Anthony: We can have a provision to that effect in the Bill.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: What prevents Government from bringing in an amendment or accepting an amendment tabled by some Members here to that effect and incorporating it in the Bill?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Parliament can do what it likes. But it cannot change the thing of somebody else. That is obvious.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Shri Frank Anthony wants that report to be changed. But my question was different. I want some provision to be made here in the Bill about sending it to the States.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): That question will be discussed in detail.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think there will be any difficulty about that. My colleague, the Home Minister, will deal with that matter that he has raised in his reply. I have no doubt he will. But the whole approach to this question must be one of the fullest consultation and agreement.

What was the purpose of the assurance that I gave, which I hold today? That is that no change of this kind will be effected in English or Hindi without the full approval of the non-Hindi people; because I wanted to remove any apprehension that possibly by a majority in Parliament or elsewhere we shall make changes which are not approved by them. As a matter of fact, this cannot be done, apart from my assurance, because it will raise such problems and such difficulties that no government can conceivably want to do it that way. That was the purpose.

Shri Frank Anthony: With great respect, what exactly did you do last time? You short-circuited Parliament. You short-circuited the unanimous Resolutions of the West Bengal and Madras Legislatures. (*Interruptions*).

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Frank Anthony: That was exactly what happened.

Shri Tyagi: Even then, English is there. (*Interruptions*).

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Unfortunately, Frank Anthony is not frank. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: That is not fair.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: One cannot refer everything.

This major question of one language conflicting with another can only be settled by consultation and general consent.

In Pondicherry, we are encouraging the French language. Definitely, we are trying to have a University there with French. Why? As a matter of fact, I do not know if the majority of the people in Pondicherry know much French. Nevertheless, because French is a valuable language and we want it to have a place in India—we want to take advantage of the knowledge of French there—we want to encourage it, to be a window. We want these to be windows of India to the outside world.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee (Nabadwip): May I ask one question?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: I have tabled an amendment also and I want to be clear about it.

An Hon. Member: This is not Question Hour.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: The Prime Minister wants all the State languages to flourish in India. I ask: being a Bengali, why am I not allowed to speak here in Bengali? (*Interruptions*). In the USSR....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: Let me finish my question. I want a clarification.

Mr. Speaker: I am giving that clarification. Let him resume his seat. Whenever he expresses a desire to speak in Bengali, he should get the answer from me, not from the Prime Minister.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: You cannot be of any help because I have to submit a translation in English if I have to speak in Bengali. Why should I have to do that?

In the USSR, every language has that privilege. They can speak in any language they like. In the Supreme Soviet, 100 peoples are gathered there. They are allowed to speak in their own languages. I have been there. Why should I not be allowed that here?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member probably has much greater information about the USSR than I possess. But what I should like to know is, at any meeting—all-Russia meeting—how many languages are used?

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: In the Supreme Soviet, there are 100 peoples gathered. Of them, 40 did not have any letters at all. So they created their letters, and languages and they are allowed to speak in those languages.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There can be no objection to anybody speaking in the various national languages—of course not. The only practical difficulty that comes in is that a large number of people will not understand them. Maybe we can evolve some system of translation, automatic, simultaneous translations and all that.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: Yes that should be done.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no objection to that.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

A little while ago I mentioned about Urdu. I feel rather particularly about Urdu. It is a good example. Here is a language. For long, the House may remember, there was a conflict between so-called Urdu and so-called Hindi in Uttar Pradesh etc. A more foolish controversy in the linguistic sense I have been unable to think of, because neither side—the protagonists on neither side—did much to progress their language but they wanted to pull down the other. The result was injury all round and little progress.

Now Urdu itself is an amalgam, a synthesis, of various languages; it is about 75—80 per cent Hindi, and about 25 per cent of the words come from other languages, Persian, maybe Arabic and Turki. It is quite clear that when two languages come together, they strengthen each other. The idea of pulling down a language and thinking that your language will profit by it is utterly wrong. Our thinking has been so much in terms of clerks and officers. It disgusts me to think that language should be associated with clerks and officers all the time. Do you develop a literary language or any language by having 100 or 1,000 or 10,000 mere clerks using it? I do not understand it. What was the conflict between Urdu and Hindi? What language should be used by the clerks in office—the same thing.

I have talked about Hindi a great deal. When I talk about Hindi, I should enter a caveat about the content of the language. It is very necessary, and the Hindi people have got to realise that more than the Bengali or Marathi or Gujarati people. There the content is not very different from popular understanding, here it is different and it is growing more and more different. That is why Gandhiji laid stress on relatively simple language, and a language which is understood by most people, and which is, to some extent, an amalgam of Hindi and Urdu as far as possible, retaining the basis of Hindi, the genius as

Hindi. The moment you stop words coming in, you stop the progress of the language.

I should like the House to consider this matter not only in the limited sense in which we have been arguing it, but in the broader sense, in the wider context. We are passing through difficult and delicate periods of transition in many ways, and it requires wisdom from us and a capacity and flexibility in order to meet the demands of the times. Rigidity stops growth. The main question is of India's growth in every way, materially, scientifically, industrially, intellectually and spiritually. We must view every step that we take from the point of that major question. What will it profit us if we honour Hindi and put it in a closed space, which prevents not only its growth, but the nation's growth? The growth of our languages is essentially tied up with the growth of the nation. Both help each other. We must, therefore, look upon this question in this wide context and see to it that we advance all along the line to reach the great goal that we have in view.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: The reply would be given by the Home Minister. No questions now. Shri Mahatab.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): May I seek a clarification?

Mr. Speaker: The reply will come from the Home Minister if he has any questions to ask.

Shri Mahatab (Angul): I have been waiting since yesterday to be called to speak, and I am very thankful to you for giving me time at last.

Before I proceed to discuss the provisions of the Bill which, according to me, is a straightforward one and should not have created this controversy, I would like to say a few words about the general question of language.