

*Resolution Re:
Steps to promote
secular outlook
in the country*

will tempt the chit funds to resort to unfair means. Hence the Commission should be raised to 7 1/2 per cent.

Clause 22(1) provides that the Foreman should pay the prize amount within seven days after the date of the draw. The subscribers are to furnish authentic documents before the money is disbursed. Supposing there is delay on the part of subscribers in producing documents and more than 7 days is taken in that, the Foreman should not be held responsible for the delay. The time should be extended till the subscribers produce the required documents.

This Bill is a regulatory measure for the promoters of Chit Funds. But what happens to the defaulting subscribers? If a suit is filed in a Court of Law, it takes about 4, 5 years before the case is decided. By that time the Chit Fund may be in the stage of winding up. If four subscribers decide to default, then there is no alternative for the Chit Fund except to close the shop. Even with all relevant and authentic documents, it will take years to have the cases settled in the Courts of Law. There should be a legal provision that the cases against the defaulters should be completed as expeditiously as possible, within a period of three months. Such a legislative protection must be given to the promoters of Chit Funds.

I would in the end refer to the diversion of chit money and the profits by the promoters in Hotels, Races etc. at the cost of subscribers. I would not like to refer to those Chit Funds by their names. There are stringent provisions in the Bill which should be implemented effectively. Before I conclude I would like to have explanation from the hon. Deputy Finance Minister for banning the Banks from conducting Chits. Since this is a public utility measure, I extend my wholehearted support to it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Bhiku Ram Jain.

SHRI BHIKU RAM JAIN: There is only one minute left.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You speak one or two sentences and then continue next time.

SHRI BHIKU RAM JAIN (Chandni Chowk): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to welcome the introduction of this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now you can continue next time.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FORTY-FOURTH REPORT

श्री चन्द्रबे प्रसाद वर्मा (आरा) : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि यह सभा 14 जुलाई, 1982 को सभा में प्रस्तुत किए गए गैर-सरकारी सदस्यों के विधेयकों तथा संकल्पों संबंधी समिति के 44वें प्रतिवेदन से सहमत है।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Forty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 14th July, 1982."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE: STEPS TO PROMOTE SECULAR OUTLOOK IN THE COUNTRY

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now we shall take up further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shrimati Vidya Chennupati on 23rd April, 1982:—

"Keeping in view the secular character of our Constitution and the fact that secularism is one of the basic tenets of our State Policy, this House recommends to the Government to take immediate steps to:—

(a) promote a sense of castelessness through inter-caste and inter-religion marriages;

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

(b) prepare suitable text books to propagate secular ideas by laying emphasis on fundamental duties enshrined in the Constitution;

(c) encourage secular outlook among the employees working in Government and Public Sector Undertakings;

So that a feeling of national brotherhood and of human dignity is Promoted among the people."

The time left for this Resolution is only 8 minutes, but there are many speakers who want to speak on this. What is the consensus of the House?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Two hours more should be extended.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: So, the time for this Resolution is extended upto 5.30 p.m.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): You have not taken our opinions.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to satisfy you also. I know you want to move your resolution. This resolution is also very important.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I was making my humble submissions with respect to secular outlook. I am quoting Chief Justice Das who had made this remark while dealing with the Kerala Education Bill. He says on page 600 as follows:

"Throughout the ages endless inundations of men of diverse creeds, cultures and races—Aryans and non-Aryans, Dravidians and Chinese, Scythians, Huns, Pathans and Mughals—have come to this ancient land from distant regions and climes. India has welcomed them all. They have met and gathered, given and taken and got mingled, merged and lost in one body. India's tradition has thus been epitomised in the following noble lines:

'None shall be turned away

From the shore of this vast sea of humanity

That is India.'

We have before us this resolution for the promotion of secular outlook. There are various other pertinent points that I may say. The Koran says: "Lakum di nakum Valeyadin"—to you your religion; to me my religion. At another place, it says "La ikraha fid-din"—there is no Compulsion in matters of religion. It is this outlook that has to be developed.

And it is only then that we can have a society of which we will be proud. Sir, I may refer here to an important point in the Resolution. The Resolution speaks about inter-religious marriages. It is rather unfortunate that the efforts for promotion of secular outlook have fallen a victim to certain misconceptions and myths. This is one of them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I may submit that inter-religious marriages can create various complications also. Now, I have before me the conclusions of a study, that was made by Dr. Bambawala and Dr. Ramanamma of the Department of Sociology, University of Poona. Their article appeared in the *Mainstream* in its issue dated the 1st May, 1982. About marriages and the blind rush for the promotion of inter-religious marriages this remark is very pertinent. I quote:

'A successful marriage depends upon agreement on basic values, affectional intimacy, accommodation, euhoria and certain other factors. Disagreement is more likely to arise between dissimilar persons, and marital problems against the heterogamously married reflect conflicts in the cultural background of the people concerned.'

Therefore, various factors have to be taken into account before you pronounce your judgment with respect to marriages. In this study—they made a special study—they have presented certain figures. We are told, again I quote—

'...only 36 per cent men and 40 per cent women had absolutely no

objection to their spouse's pattern of worship. Those who resented their spouses following their own religion felt that the children should not be unduly influenced by one parent.'

Therefore, I respectfully submit before the House that this question of just blindly rushing to promote inter-religious marriages by providing them with certain encouragement and all, may have a disastrous effect and may not lead to the achievement of the noble ideals that are there. As you know, religions regulate marriages. (*Interruptions*) Islam also does it. There are injunctions with respect to inter-religious marriages, and it is in consonance with the secular outlook that these injunctions have to be duly respected.

Sir, the crux of the entire matter is that in a society of the type that we have, a multi religious society, a multi-lingual society, a multi-cultural society, due justice should be given to every section of the population so that the entire nation is welded into one. This is the crux of the problem. We must find out whether due justice is given to one and all. I would here like to only make a passing reference to the situation that confronts the various sections of the population, the situation—the humiliating situation—that our Harijan brothers, those of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, face. It is pathetic. It is a Challenging task for us. We have to accept the challenge and to see that the situation improves and that real equality and the sense of brotherhood prevail everywhere.

Take the question of Muslims. I will not try to misuse this occasion by giving a long discourse upon the same. It is only for the purpose of strengthening the point that what is needed is justice to all sections of the population in an effort to weld all of them into a harmonious whole, into a nation of which we can be proud. I am making a reference to 'The Tribune' of 6th December, 1978 which says:

"Muslims form about 11 per cent of the population but, according to unofficial data, there are less than a dozen Muslims including one Class I officer,

two Class II officers and four each in Class III and Class IV categories in the Union Home Ministry. In the Border Security Force Muslims constitute only 4 per cent of the total strength of 80,000 and in the CRP the Muslim quota at present is barely 6 per cent."

There has been a steady deterioration all these years in the economic position of the Muslims of India. The deterioration has reached such low depths that I may draw your attention to the situation as it prevails now in Pune the cultural capital of Maharashtra. In Pune, the economic situation of Muslims has so deteriorated that today Muslims are obliged to accept sub-employment from those of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, who are appointed to clean and sweep the city of Pune by the Pune Municipal Corporation. They cannot even get the employment of sweepers from the Pune Municipal Corporation. We have already reached that depth. Therefore, it is necessary that an economic deal, a fair deal, has to be given. We have to look at the economic backwardness and educational backwardness of various sections of our population. It is only when a fair deal is given to them that we will be in a position to promote the sense of national brotherhood, the purpose for which this Resolution has been brought.

I congratulate the Mover of the Resolution for having given us an opportunity to discuss this question, which is of great importance and of extreme relevance to the prevalent situation. There is no dearth of suggestions that have been made from time to time for promotion of a secular outlook. We have had several commissions on communal troubles. They have made various suggestions. They are there. But what is our attitude towards those suggestions? They are observed in breach. I will not take many instances to substantiate this particular point. Take, for example, the Madan Commission. When, some time back, we had riots in Bhiwandi, Mahad and Jalagon, the Government of Maharashtra appointed a Commission of Inquiry, headed by Mr. Justice Madan. After years of labour, we had a very good report from Justice Madan. One of the recom-

[Shri G. M. Banatwalla]

mentations of the Commissions of Inquiry headed by Justice Madan was that when processions of a controversial nature are being taken out, then at least Ministers should not participate in such processions, or associate themselves with such processions, because it can create complications and affect the decisions that the administration may have to take without any prejudice.

But what happened? We had a Shiv Jayanti procession sometime back in Kalyan. Since it was of a controversial nature and there were certain objections with respect to route and other things, for several years the procession had been banned. But this time this controversial procession was taken out. Did the Chief Minister or the Government of Maharashtra follow the recommendation of Justice Madan? No. Several Ministers were leading the procession, or were associated with the procession.

This is one example to show that there is no dearth of recommendations with us. But, then, there must be a will to act upon those recommendations. If there is a will, then I am sure that we will be able to tackle the present situation, as it is. Unfortunately, there is increasing communal propaganda, vicious propaganda, and we hardly see any action being taken with respect to that propaganda. Therefore, I emphasize that what is needed is the will to act strongly and sternly, with a view to see that justice is done, peace is maintained and real secular outlook emerges.

There are various other things. But, then, we may wait for some other occasion for referring to them. Sir, I thank you very much for the time that you have given me. The Mover of the Resolution has to be congratulated, subject to my observations, for having brought this Resolution before the House and given us an opportunity to submit our observations on this matter of vital importance, on which rests the very network of relations in the country.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am rather surprised with

the use made by my hon. friend, Shri Banatwalla, of this Resolution to bring, in his very persuasive, quiet but not so very wise manner, extraneous items and considerations into the discussion of this Resolution. We are not discussing now the inter-religious quarrels, discriminations and disabilities inflicted upon each other. My hon. friend was right when he said that our thoughts are very good, but our practice does not seem to be so good. So, he made two quotations from Quran and Quarn has said it rightly that 'you have your religions, I have my religion'. But India's experience has been different. History denies their practice in regard to this matter. Their practice has not been in conformity with this preaching given by Quran. In politics we are having 'Aya Rams' and 'Gaya Rams': in religion also we had 'Aya Rams' and 'Gaya Rams'. If it is voluntary 'Aya Rams' and 'Gaya Rams', it could be tolerated. If it is based upon money, many of our friends take objection to that. If it is also based upon violence, then everybody violently disagrees with it. We know what the lessons of history have been, I need not go very much into that. I know only one thing. Whoever marries a Hindu does not find it necessary to become a Hindu if he is not a Hindu, but whoever marries a Catholic or a Muslim finds it somehow or other willy nilly often that he has to necessarily become either a Catholic or a Mohammedan. I do not know why it has happened, but it happens. Therefore, I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend that we may not be over-enthusiastic in propagating that there should be inter-religious marriages, although I have not objection. We leave it to the people themselves. Let them marry. But then my hon. friend is afraid, he does not say so; it looks like that, that he does not want these inter-religious marriages. What about inter-caste marriages? We need them, we like them, we advocate them. But when actually people have got the courage to practise these inter-caste marriages? We do not encourage them, we do not help them, we do not seem to make it easy for them to have comfortable life. They seem to be falling in between two stools, they gain nothing at all, and that

is why the import of this Resolution is that Government should take some special steps in order to encourage those people who have got the courage to go through inter-caste marriages, to welcome inter-caste marriages within their own families. We have some Ministers who have had the courage to welcome inter-caste marriages. I do not think they have gained much. Many of them must have suffered a lot and I do not find that as a result of their inter-caste marriages they have gained anything at all in politics. On the other hand, quite a large number of them suffered. Neither of the castes owns them with the result they suffer. This is what is happening. I know of various other people also, among teachers, among professors, among lawyers. To which caste do the children belong? To the father's caste or to the mother's caste? And the children, if they seek marriages again, how do they get their spouse—this side or that side? The mother wants her side and the father wants his side, and it creates a discordant note in their family life. Why? Because our society is caste-ridden. Therefore, from their childhood we have got to try and help our children to think of the past as something not so very good, not so very wholesome, not so very conducive to national integration and national unity. Are we prepared to do that? We must do it. That is the import of this Resolution. Similarly, it is in regard to religion also. But then my hon. friends are not prepared to have secular system of legislation. When we wanted to change the Hindu Code there was so much of objection from so many sections of Hindus and they said, "Why do you want to impose this thing on us alone? Why do you not have a regular code for everybody on social matters?" Our friends, the Muslims, would not like to have it. We as a secular Government, non-religious Government, have got to fold our hands and then say, "All right, we will be contended with this Hindu Code because we some how or the other have to manage with Hindus." But we cannot manage with our Muslim friends and, therefore, let them have their shirayat and workabilities according to their own law, according to their own religion. Let them carry on. Where is the secular idea here? These are all the inconsistencies which

are built into our social life as well as our political life. We must get over these inconsistencies. How can we do it? We grown ups are very queer people. We do not seem to be acting properly. Are we hypocrites? We dare not say so. Are we sincere? We want to be sincere but are we really sincere and are we really honest in our behaviour? We are not. We must own the truth. We are all the time moving in our respective religious capsules, our caste capsules also. How can we get over this? It is not because of want of great men who teach us the right things and that we are behaving in such a bad way. From the days of Buddha, earlier from the days when the rishies wrote up-nishads and right down to Vivekananda we have been preaching to our people the right thing. But somehow we have been caught in this terrible snare and prison of our social system. There is something wrong in our social system—whether it is of the communists, whether it is of the Catholics or the Muslims or the Christians or the Hindus. This system has got to be broken. I do not think we would be able to break it with the help of the State. We would have to break it through our respected religious leaders, preachers and our elders. We have got to make a move. How are we to move it? We need money. We need....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No religious leaders is secular.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: We need organisation and it has got to be a continuing process. We have had in South India, in recent times, many great men and one of them who had never achieved power in the manner in which power is being understood by the treasury benches-wise. Shri E. V. Ramaswamy Naicker. He went through any number of struggles. Many number of times he went to jail. He allowed himself to be ridiculed by so many people. He went to the extent of insulting Hindus in a sacrilegious matter also in order to free them from the bondage of this caste idea embedded in our Puranas. He did all that. It is because of that my hon. friend, the Deputy Speaker and his party and the other rival party, but sister party, in South India were able to achieve power. But they have not been

[Prof. N. G. Ranga]

able to break through this terrible system of casteism or religious taboos. We need such people like Shri E. V. Ramaswamy Naicker. We need not go to the days of Vivekananda. Here was this man. He never wore ochre clothes. He never claimed himself to be a swamy or anything like that. But he fought our social system.

We need such people. He made friends with the Muslims, with the Christians, with the Hindus. We need such preachers. Where are they? How are they to arise? Who is to stand by them? These are the challenges in this atmosphere.

16.00 hours.

[SHRI HARINATHA MISHRA *in the Chair*]

What is the role that the Government can play? It has got its schools at its disposal. Text books are at its disposal. It has got a huge, big broadcasting machinery, equipment at its disposal. Let it go on using this and other opportunities that it has in order to strengthen the hands of such people like E. V. Ramasamy Naicker and also to strengthen and popularise the tenets, the best possible tenets, the most progressive tenets of all religions that we find in all these religious books and to popularise them through these school books, text books and with the help of school teachers. That is what we can expect the Government to do. We cannot expect the Government to interfere in inter-religious marriages. Immediately, we will face criticism from Catholics and Christians. We cannot expect them to carry on a kind of propaganda which is likely to upset the religious sentiment, and cannot expect them to talk on casteism, priesthood or Mullahism or Panditism or anything like that. But certainly, the Government can do a lot through the great institution of education and also the institution of broadcasting. That is what I expect the Government to do.

Some efforts are being made in some of the States. Why? My own Party was expected to give some preference in nominating people for various positions, to those people who have had the courage to go through inter-caste marriages. But we

have not succeeded. Governments have offered some incentives in recruiting for Government jobs and so on to those people who have had to the courage and the social stamina to have inter-caste marriages either between themselves—husband and wife or among their own children. So far, fortunately, nobody has taken objection. I hope, no objection would be raised to any such effort being made by the Government. But then the difficulty is how much and how far has the Government to go in giving preference in selection to Government jobs and so on? We have already got so many reservations, as you know. In addition, people like me, freedom fighters want some reservations. Now, the inter-caste people also ask for reservations.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: You have already got the reserved seat in Parliament for many years.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: I have not asked for anything. I did not get anything.

One has to go rather cautiously by giving incentives, by way of jobs and by way of grants, because grant of money is easier. Then with inflation, you can go on producing more and more. Therefore, the financial incentives you may give. But governmental jobs-incentive is rather very dangerous thing. I would not like the Government to march too fast in this direction.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR (Ratnagiri): They will take the job and then divorce the wife.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: I do not know. I would like the Government to proceed in a cautious manner, yet the Government to be progressive. I want the Government to think about it in cooperation with the leaders of not only various parties but also the religious representatives of different religions. We should evolve a policy which would be common to all religions; common to all castes, which would be accepted by everybody but which would not be like Hindu Code on the one side and Shariat on the other and Roman Catholicism in the third direction. If you introduce that kind of a distinction, if you accept it, once again you will introducing by way of so-called cosmopolitanism that

is being suggested in the resolution another kind of reservation, another kind of casteism and another kind of tabooism which would be dangerous indeed for the future.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR:

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I congratulate Shrimati Vidya Chennupati for having focused the attention of the Government through this resolution to a very important point and I thank her for giving me an opportunity to express my views over the subject.

I had an opportunity to express my views over this subject once or twice in this august House and, therefore, today I have decided to restrict myself to one point to which a reference was made by my senior eminent colleague, I mean, Prof. Ranga in his speech. Ever since the inauguration of our Constitution, the Government has done much to implement the ideal of secularism in the basic law of this land. So far, after the Constitution has come into force, as far as Hindu community is concerned, the Government after withdrawing the Hindu Code Bill has progressively moved ahead in the direction of adopting legislation in regard to marriage, divorce, succession and adoption affairs of the Hindus. The personal law of the Hindus—I am making a reference to this personal law for a specific reason which I would submit later—has been drastically changed. I have no objection to that; it was absolutely necessary. That has been drastically changed if one can compare it with the traditional law as emanating from the Shastras. As the time changes, we have to change ourselves; we have to be flexible in order to have a social life and social welfare. In our society, these changes are necessary. But what pains me is that the question of reforming other communities stands unchanged. The Government of India, it seems, has well taken the view that such other laws cannot be amended or touched unless there is a strong demand made by the particular community.

In the last session, I had put a question to the Minister of Law as to what steps the Government had taken to implement

article 44 of the Constitution which came into force on 26th January, 1950—32 years have elapsed. I was told that unless that particular community comes forward with a demand, the Government is not going to make any changes in the personal law. I am going to request the Government that the Government should reconsider as to whether measures of social welfare and reforms in their personal law are necessary or are not necessary.

We have in our statute books a personal law, a provision, that if a man has to re-marry a divorced wife, that woman has to re-marry a stranger. That marriage has to be dissolved by a decree or divorce. Prior to that it has to be proved that the marriage was consummated and after the divorce, the first husband's marriage with his first wife, is a legal marriage.

Are we not going to change this law? I will tell you an interesting case in the court. A young man governed by this law, after marriage, went to London for his higher studies. His father wrote him a letter about the boy's wife. The boy believed his father and from London divorced his wife who was in India. After he came back, he found that the information which his father got, was not correct and that he did great injustice to his wife and, therefore, he thought of re-marrying her. The impediment came in the way because according to the personal law, that girl has to be re-married. He got her married to a friend of his and asked him to divorce. And unfortunately that friend of his refused to divorce her! The matter is pending in the court of law.

Now, we are really coming to the end of the 20th century and still we have not made any progress in this connection. The Minister of Law is also here.

Is it not necessary that we should change such laws and is it only because these laws are claimed to have come from Gods that we should not change these laws? There are so many persons who have taken up these problems. But the religious heads have beaten the reformists who propagated that this law should be changed. Therefore, I request that at least after 32 years, the Government should consider whether

*secular outlook
in the country.*

[Shri Bapusaheb Parulekar]

the time has come or not to implement Article 44 of the Constitution.

Even in Christian law, as far as divorce is concerned, only the husband gets the right of divorce on the ground of adultery by the wife. But the wife does not get this right.

There are so many incidents and cases of which I had the fortune or misfortune to conduct. But I have no time to say here.

The framers of our Constitution in their wisdom gave the direction that in order to have complete secularism in our country, there shall be a uniform civil code.

But I do not know as to why the Government is scared of having that particular legislation.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: There should be consensus among all.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR : I am coming to that. I am coming to the point of consensus. Whatever objections have been raised, those very objections were raised when this Article was being discussed by the Constituent Assembly and I would submit the amendments which were given by the two Hon. Members, Mr. Mohd. Ismail and Mr. Nasruddin Ahmad, to the House: That was Article 45 in the Constituent Bill:

"Provided that any group or community of people shall not be obliged to give up its own personal law in case it has such a law."

The second amendment was moved by Mr. Nasruddin Ahmad:

"Provided that the personal law of any community which is guaranteed by the Statute shall not be changed except with the previous approval of the community ascertained in such a manner as the Union Legislature may determine by law."

And this was debated for 4 days and after debate Dr. Ambedkar and Shri K. M.

Munshi summed up and both the amendments were unanimously rejected.

Where is the occasion now to make the same plea and say that unless there is a unanimous consensus of all, this cannot be done?

This is only an excuse.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: No.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: If there is a common civil code, I believe, of course, some precautions have been laid down there. I may refer, for the information of this august House, to what our founders said about this particular Article? Dr. Ambedkar said:

"I am afraid I cannot accept the amendments which have been moved to this article....."

"My friend, Mr. Hussain Imam, in rising to support the amendments, asked whether it was possible and desirable to have a uniform Code of laws for a country so vast as this is. Now I must confess that I was very much surprised at that statement for the simple reason that we have in this country a uniform code of laws covering almost every aspect of human relationship..."

except the personal laws.

While rejecting this contention which was off and on pleaded on behalf of these communities, Dr. Ambedkar said:

"Coming to the amendments, there are only two observations which I would like to make. My first observation would be to state that members who put forth these amendments say that the Muslim personal law, so far as this country was concerned, was immutable and uniform through the whole of India. Now I wish to challenge that statement. I think most of my friends who have spoken on this amendment have quite forgotten that upto 1935 the North-West Frontier Province was not subject to the Shariat Law. It followed the Hindu Law in the matter of succession and in other matters, so much so that it was in 1939 that the Central Legislature had to come into the field and to

abrogate the application of the Hindu law to the Muslims of the North-West Frontier Province and to apply the Shariat Law to them. That is not all..."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The subject is certainly very interesting. But the whole deliberation has to be over by 5.42 p.m. The list of speakers before me is so large. That is why I have to request you to be brief.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR: I entirely agree with you. I will conclude in two minutes.

"My hon. friends have forgotten that, apart from the North-West Frontier Province, uptill 1937 in the rest of India, in various parts such as the United Provinces, the Central Provinces and Bombay, the Muslims to a large extent were governed by the Hindu Law in the matter of succession. In order to bring them on the plane of uniformity with regard to the other Muslims who observed the Shariat Law, the Legislature had to intervene in 1937 and to pass an enactment applying the Shariat Law to the rest of India."

This is the last quotation.

"Therefore, if it was found necessary that for the purpose of evolving a single civil code applicable to all citizens irrespective of their religion, certain portions of the Hindu Law, not because they were contained in Hindu Law but because they were found to be the most suitable, were incorporated into the new civil code projected by article 35, I am quite certain that it would not be open to any Muslim to say that the framers of the civil code had done great violence to the sentiments of the Muslim community."

This is what Dr. Ambedkar and all other members of the Constituent Assembly had said. Now this very argument is being advanced even 33 years after the framing of the Constitution that a uniform civil code cannot be passed unless the Muslims and other minority communities come together and say that it can be passed. If we want to have integrity of the nation, unity of the nation, a uniform civil code

is necessary; these different kinds of laws are an impediment to the integrity and secularism of our country. I would, therefore, request and appeal to the Government to reconsider the entire position and take immediate steps to have a uniform civil code without fear or favour, and that is the need of the day....

PROF. N. G. RANGA: It should be an appeal to Parliament.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR : Of course, I am making this appeal to the Parliament, to all Members of Parliament.

I have to make only one more observation and that is with reference to what my learned and esteemed colleague, Shri Banatwalla, has said. He referred to the Shivaji procession taken in Kalyan: he said that it had been banned long back. The Shivaji procession was being taken not because he was a religious leader but because he was a national leader, and if it was banned wrongly, that does not mean that the ban should be continued. The Chief Minister of Maharashtra had the courage to lead that particular procession, and I submit that it would not be proper to say that the Shivaji procession, because Shivaji happened to be a Hindu though a national leader, should be banned because their sentiments would otherwise be hurt. That would not lead to secularism, that would destroy the unity and hurt the feelings of many people.

I would, therefore, say that I fully support the grounds which are given in the Resolution; I feel, they are only illustrative and not exhaustive, and I submit that what I have said should also be taken as a ground which would lead us to integration and promote secularism in our country.

श्रीमती कृष्णा वाही (बेगूसराय): सभापति महोदय, श्रीमती विद्या चन्नुपत्ति जी ने जो प्रस्ताव यहाँ उपस्थापित किया है, वह हमारे देश में जो आज की परिस्थिति है उसमें बहुत ही मौजू प्रस्ताव है। इस के लिए मैं उन्हें बधाई देना चाहती हूँ। उन्होंने बड़ा ही साहसिक कदम उठाया है।

[श्रीमती कृष्णा साही]

हमारे देश की जो ऐतिहासिक पृष्ठ-भूमि रही है उसमें पहले इस प्रकार की बुराई नहीं थी। पहले यह नहीं होता था कि सवर्ण और अवर्ण में शादी-विवाह न हों। एक धर्म वाले दूसरे धर्म में शादी-विवाह करते थे। लेकिन समाज में बहुत बाद में आकर के ऐसा हुआ कि समाज, धर्म और जात-पात की परिभाषा में बंध गया और इनकी बुराईयों में जकड़ गया।

सभापति महोदय, हमारे बीच में बड़े बड़े नेता हुए हैं बड़े बड़े धर्म प्रतीक हुए हैं। सभी ने यह कहा है कि मजहब नहीं लिखाता आपस में बैर रखना। लेकिन आजकल तो हिन्दू-मुसलमान के दंगे हुआ करते हैं, जातियों के नाम पर दंगे हुआ करते हैं, भाषा और क्षेत्रीयता के नाम पर भी दंगे होते हैं। सभापति महोदय, आप जानते हैं, जब हम अपने क्षेत्र में जाते हैं और पंचायतों की बैठक में जाते हैं तो वहाँ पंचायतवाद की बात भी लागू करने लगते हैं। इस-लिए ऐसे समय में इस प्रस्ताव की बहुत आवश्यकता है।

हमारे समाज में जो सामाजिक बुराईयाँ थीं और जब वे काफी पनप रहीं थीं उस समय में हमारे राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन ने देश में सामाजिक क्रांति लाने की बहुत बड़ी चपेटा की थी और हमें उसमें सफलता भी मिली थी। हमारे समाज में जो परम्परागत रूढ़ियाँ विद्यमान थीं उनको समाप्त करने के लिए राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन के हमारे नेताओं ने बहुत बड़ा योगदान किया था। हमारी महिलाओं ने आगे बढ़ कर के राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन में भाग लिया और बहुत सी रूढ़ियों को दूर कराने में सफलता पायी।

इस प्रकार के कानून तो बनने चाहिए क्योंकि हम जंगल में तो रहते नहीं हैं लेकिन इस के साथ साथ यह भी जरूरी है कि देश में सामाजिक परिवर्तन भी हों। देश में सामाजिक परिवर्तन लाने के लिए हमें समाज का दृष्टिकोण बदलना होगा। 19 वीं शताब्दी में राजा राम मोहन राय से ले कर महात्मा गांधी तक ने देश में से

सामाजिक बुराईयाँ दूर करने और अन्त-जातीय विवाह को प्रोत्साहन देने के लिए बहुत काम किया है। इस अन्तर्जातीय और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विवाह का हमारे देश में सब से ज्वलंत उदाहरण हमारी प्रधान मंत्री और उनका परिवार है। उन्होंने राष्ट्रीय ही नहीं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भाईचारे को बढ़ाया और शादी-विवाह किये। उनके परिवार में यह सब हुआ है।

अब मैं दो-तीन सुझाव देना चाहती हूँ। हमारे संविधान की नवीं अनुसूची में अन्तर्जातीय विवाह को प्रोत्साहन देने के लिए प्रावधान होना चाहिए। जो लड़कियाँ या लड़के ऐसा करें उनको एन्करेजमेंट के लिए इनाम दिया जाए।

इस रिजॉल्यूशन में यह लिखा है कि :

"Prepare suitable text books to propagate secular ideas by laying emphasis on fundamental duties."

इसके लिए मेरा कहना है कि यह बहुत ही आवश्यक है क्योंकि समाज की बुराईयाँ एक-दो दिन में तो जाती नहीं हैं। बचपन से ही हमें बच्चों के हृदयों में यह विठाना होगा कि सामाजिक बुराईयों से कैसे लड़ना चाहिए। बड़े होने पर उनके व्यक्तित्व का उसी प्रकार से विकास होगा और हमारा समाज स्वच्छ होगा और इस से हमारा राष्ट्र भी ऊँचा राष्ट्र बनता जाएगा।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस जमाने में जब यह बात बड़े जोरों से चल रही है कि सवर्ण और अवर्ण में शादी नहीं होगी, उसका कारण हमारा साइंस और टेक्नोलॉजी की ओर जाना भी है। पुराने जमाने में यह समस्याएँ नहीं थीं क्योंकि जब साइंस और टेक्नोलॉजी का यूग नहीं था और लोग अपने गांवों में रहते थे और उनका मूखधंधा खेती था। बाढ़ आ जाए या और कोई विपदा आ जाए तब भी वे अपना गांव नहीं छोड़ते थे। इस तरह से वे अपने शादी-विवाह भी अपने गांव में ही करते थे। लेकिन जब से यह अरबनाइजेशन हो रहा है, शहरीकरण

हो रहा है और लोग दूर दूर जा कर बस रहे हैं तब से यह बुराई अधिक हो गयी है इसलिए वर्तमान समय में यह बहुत आवश्यक है कि दूसरी धर्म और जाति के लोगों में शादी-विवाह हों, तभी समाज में बुराइयों दूर होंगी।

हमारा भारत-वर्ष संस्कृति और सभ्यता में बहुत धनी रहा है, तभी तो विदेशों से लोग आकृष्ट होकर अभी भी हमारे देश में आ रहे हैं। अगर कुछ न होता तो क्यों लोग आते? वे हमारे देश से कुछ सीखना चाहते हैं।

इसीलिए मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमारे देश के संविधान का जो आधार धर्म निरपेक्षता है उसके लिए यह चीज अत्यंत आवश्यक है। इसके ऊपर अमल करने के लिए हमें इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करना चाहिए।

नारी को पहले भी शक्ति और ज्ञान का प्रतीक माना जाता था, लेकिन बाद में कहा जाने लगा कि यह तो अबला है, इसको घर में रहना चाहिए, यह अज्ञानी और कमजोर है, लेकिन ऐसी बात पहले नहीं थी। पुराणों और शास्त्रों में किसी भी महिला का ऐसा स्थान नहीं था।

इसलिए मैं श्रीमति विद्या चेल्लपत्ति को बधाई देती हूँ। इसको सब लोगों को स्वीकार करना चाहिए। यह बहुत अच्छा प्रस्ताव है और वर्तमान समय में इसकी बहुत आवश्यकता है।

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRA-BORTY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Resolution is very important, particularly if we consider it in the context of the recent developments in our country.

It is most unfortunate—I am sure the Members of this House belonging to all political parties will agree with me—that the recent developments that we witnessed, particularly, in the Punjab, in Assam and in certain other places also, the recent strengthening of the communal forces and their open articulation of the communal principles is a great danger for our country. In this context, I consider

this Resolution to be very important and I know that this Resolution will be supported by all the Members of this House. If you all agree, then we have to question as to why is it that the communal forces—have arisen and why is it that though this principle has been enshrined in our Constitution, in the Preamble, we have said and in various Articles of our Constitution we have said that India, that is, Bharat, will be a Secular State? Our national leaders had fought for secularism. That is also true. Now, after thirty-five years of Independence, we cannot accuse the Britishers. I know how these communal forces were encouraged by the colonial powers so that they could exploit the people and that was why they wanted to keep the people divided on the basis of religion. Unfortunately, our country got partitioned and, after that, why is it today that we find in Assam the Viswa Hindu Parishad openly propagating 'drive out the Muslims' they are not Indians?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (New Delhi): That is not correct.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRA-BORTY: Mr. Vajpayee, when you get the chance say that. I shall stand corrected. But, I have got the report of the meetings. (Interruptions) I have seen that in the press.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: That is wrong.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRA-BORTY: In Assam, you know they say that these Muslims are foreigners and get them out. And also, unfortunately, in India Jamait-Ee-Elsami is propagating Islamic fundamentalism. This is the danger. In Punjab they are demanding a separate State on the basis of religion. This is the danger. I do not want to accuse anybody but we have to ask this question why is it that these communal forces are getting so strong? Why is it even today they have millions of supporters?

Sir, I hope you will excuse me if I try to go into history. You will see the Greek philosophers like Socrates, Plato and Aris-

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty]

total divorced politics from religion. They discussed politics as a separate subject. They never mixed politics with religion. In the Medieval period politics was mixed with religion and the whole of Europe had religious wars for hundreds of years. Then through their experience they understood that religion must be totally divorced from politics and they said:

"Gove unto Caesar what is Caesar's and Give to God what is God's."

It meant that your allegiance is to the non-religious Government—the State. Afterwards the secular States were established in Europe. We have borrowed many ideas from Europe including democratic principles and also the secular principles. Now we find that there is no observance. Though in our Constitution we have made provision for secularism yet in our actual practice we do not observe secularism—particularly our political leaders. We have not divorced religion from politics and administration. In a country like ours where there are many religions the administration should be completely divorced from religion.

What is the meaning of secularism. Some people say that the meaning of secularism is to encourage all religions. Is it so! Should not secularism mean that the activities of the State should not be directed to strengthen this or that religion? I think it should be so. Otherwise you cannot have real secularism. Just as you cannot have real casteless society if in our activity we strengthen a particular caste so I say it should be not on the basis of caste but the individual should be regarded as an individual. That is why in our Constitution we have provided "irrespective of caste, creed and sex".

Sir, I must say that responsibility for the encouragement of this tendency lies with the ruling party.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: All parties are responsible.

PROF. SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: But your party is charged with the administration of the country; you have

got the citable of power in your hands; you have got the authority, you have got the power to do certain things; what you do will have very serious repercussions. All these years, though the ruling party has been propagating secularism, in practice, they, never observed secularism. Is it necessary for the Prime Minister to go from one temple to another temple? I am not saying that she must not have religious beliefs. But as Prime Minister she should not appear to be the leader of any particular religions. This is my point. It is not only the Prime Minister, all your political leaders are indulging in the same practice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please try to conclude now.

PROF. SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: The next point I wish to put forward is this. There are some persons today who are preaching Hindu communalism, who are talking in terms of Hindu State, India is for the Hindus etc. Some of your people are directly and indirectly supporting it. What we therefore find today is that all the communal forces are trying to assert themselves. Both of these tendencies have to be curbed. What did we find in the Kerala election? You combined with all the casteist and religious forces...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you must conclude now. Your time is over.

PROF. SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: I am concluding. You preach well. You teach well. But I accuse your party. You never observe what you teach and what you preach. Please search your own hearts. Are you not doing things from your own narrow political aims?

PROF. N. G. RANGA: Have you a heart?

PROF. SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: I have a large heart, which is large enough to accommodate you. (Interruptions) When they get a chance to speak, let them speak, not now. Now they are at the receiving end. In Kerala what hap-

pend? You combined with all casteist and religious forces. Because, you decided that your main enemy is the Marxists. Everywhere you have been encouraging secessionist forces; you encouraged such secessionist forces in Assam. Such secessionist forces were being encouraged because of your own narrow political ends. All I can say in this Parliament is that my party and the Leftist Forces, the Forward Bloc, the RSP, the CPI and others were attacked in Assam. People know that we fought the secessionist forces, not your party, not your people. We have instances of many communal riots taking place. Some of your own people are also involved in them. If such communal clashes occur in our country even after 35 years of independence, is it not something about which the ruling party should concern itself? But the ruling party is just not concerned about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

PROF. SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: You can pass any number of resolutions just to hoodwink the people. The responsibility is yours and nobody else's. Just to obtain your own narrow political ends you encouraged the communal forces and casteist forces and also you fought the Leftist forces which have really been fighting all along against communalism and casteism. By moving this Resolution, you just can't white-wash your misdeeds and appear to be very secular and very non-communal. It cannot be. Your party is responsible for this. So, I request the Ruling Party to search its own heart and see what it preaches is followed in practice. There is a hiatus, a great hiatus between what you say and what you do. Even then I would congratulate the hon. Member who has moved this Resolution because she has included in the Resolution some operative part and I believe that after you pass the Resolution you will firmly adhere to the operative part of the resolution, because it enjoins some duty on the State Government and also the Central Government. I must say this. The Resolution mentions about the promotion of a sense of castelessness

through inter-caste and inter-religion marriages. But when you select your Ministers and the candidates to fight the election on the basis of caste, are you really promoting castelessness? You are not doing it. All your Ministers and all your candidates are selected on the basis of caste because you think that by doing so you can win the elections. Then, if you do it, does it not mean that you are encouraging casteism? So, when you say 'castelessness' you really following the policy of castelessness.

Then, Sir, she has mentioned in the Resolution about Education. I appreciate and congratulate for what she has done. It is a very good thing. Look at the whole curriculum in educational institutions. Is the principle of secularism followed in all the educational institutions? The Central Government should go into the system of curriculum in all the educational institutions and see that it is totally secular and scientific and no obscurantism and communalism should be there. You should follow the principle of secularism in services both in Government and in public sector undertakings. This is very important and I agree with Mr. Banatwalla when he said that the Muslims constitute a large portion of our population. Why is it that they are not adequately represented in the services, in educational institutions and in Government Departments. Whatever is said in favour of secularism, the reality is that the people think of "my own people, from my own religion and from my own caste". That is what is followed. We talk of so many things. But provincialism, communalism, casteism and all these things are prevailing and I accuse you because you are ruling the country. Therefore, I request that in passing this Resolution we shall join you but please adhere to what you pass and uphold the principle of secularism in practice. Thank you.

SHRI P. NAMGYAL (Ladakh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I congratulate Shrimati Vidya Chennupati for her good points brought forward in the form of a Resolution before this House, for promotion of secularism, castelessness, etc. While sup-

[Shri P. Namgyal]

porting her Resolution, in this context I would like to say something about my own State. Sir, there was a time when Kashmir State was considered to be a model of secularism. Just after independence, Gandhi had said "there is a ray of hope that is visible in Kashmir" and obviously he was referring to the communal harmony then prevailing in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. When in many parts of our country, Hindus and Muslims were playing holi with the blood of each other, and they were burning places of worship, private houses and properties of each other. At that time Kashmir was the only State where the minorities were protected by the majority Muslim community, when Pakistan raiders and Pathans raided Kashmir valley. The region of Ladakh in Kashmir State was considered particularly to be the model of secularism in that region. Even now, Ladakh region still professes the age-old communal harmony and you will be surprised to find that in some remote villages, the husbands and wives profess different religions. One may be a follower of Buddhism and the other may be a Muslim. They cook *halal* and *jhatka* meat in one pot by attaching a tag to the piece of *halal* meat. The soup will, however, be taken only by the non-Muslims. Even now you find such a practice in a place called Kuksho in Kargil sector of Ladakh.

But unfortunately, the State of Jammu and Kashmir is no longer that model State what Gandhiji had thought when he was alive. Now communalism is being preached from the official platform by no less a person than the Chief Minister himself while addressing a huge public gathering at Hazaratbal shrine on 29th May, 1982. That was the last speech made by the Chief Minister in public before he fell ill. I am quoting from the Kashmir Times dated 29th May, 1982 published from Jammu:

"The Jammu and Kashmir Chief Minister, Sheikh Abdullah today lashed out at the critics of the Resettlement Bill and charged them with being worst Hindu communalists of north India who were not to convert the Muslim major-

ity State of Jammu and Kashmir into a Hindu majority State."

Further:

"The Sheikh said that these Hindu communalists were in power now and they were complacent about translating their designs into a reality. But, he added, 'people of Kashmir will never allow Kashmir to become a place of pilgrimage for Hindus'.

Then,

"The Sheikh said that the only reason why this Bill was being opposed by these Hindu communists, was that they were afraid that the number of Muslims in the State will increase. They want to create a Hindu majority State in Kashmir.

Muslims of Kashmir should stand united and strengthen National Conference to defeat the designs of those who do not reconcile to the Muslim majority character of Jammu and Kashmir."

These are some of the remarks he has made and I feel it is quite unfortunate. While today we are speaking of secularism, a person in power in a public meeting on an official platform is stating such things. It is quite unfortunate. Under these circumstances, by mere slogans, we cannot strengthen secularism, we cannot finish untouchability. In practice we find very few instances of inter-religion marriages, inter-caste marriages. Such examples you can find only in Ladakh.

For promoting secularism, Shrimati Vidya Chennupati has rightly suggested for preparation of suitable text-books. Schools can play a very vital role for bringing communal and inter-caste harmony. Government should encourage such persons, who enter into inter-caste marriages, inter-religious marriages. Such persons in service also should be rewarded. They should be given out of turn promotions, extra increment and so on. Merely by slogans we cannot bring secularism and we cannot finish casteism. Social organisations engaged in such

activities should be encouraged. They should be given financial assistance and other material assistance whatever they need so that they can help promote secularism and finish this casteism and such other social evils.

With these few words, I once again congratulate Shrimati Vidya Chennupati for bringing this resolution and I support her resolution.

श्री अगपाल सिंह (हरिद्वार) : सभा-पति, महोदय, मैं भी विद्या जी को मुबारकवाद देना चाहूंगा कि ऐसे वक्त पर वह अपना संकल्प ले कर आई हैं जब कि देश में देश को टुकड़े टुकड़े कर देने के लिए साम्प्रदायिक शक्तियां काम कर रही हैं। मुझ से पूर्व वक्ताओं ने इशारा किया खालिस्तान आन्दोलन की तरफ जो एक धर्म के आधार पर इस देश को टुकड़े दाँदारा कराने की कांशिश कर रहा है और सरकार उन साम्प्रदायिक आन्दोलनकारियों के सामने लग रहा है जैसे कि छूटने टके कर बैठी हुई हो। मैं उस बात को भी कहने में नहीं हिचकिचाऊंगा क्योंकि बार बार उस बात को उठाया गया है, यह भी हम लोगों को शक है कि खालिस्तान का आन्दोलन पंजाब के मुख्य मंत्री दरबारा सिंह जी और भूतपूर्व गृह मंत्री जानी जैल सिंह जी की कहीं आपस की रंरिश की वजह से तो नहीं है? इस बात का जवाब गृह मंत्री जी ने सफाई से नहीं दिया था। वह आन्दोलन चलता रहा और चल रहा है। विदेशों में भी खालिस्तान के आन्दोलन का चलाने वाले लोग देश में अपना हिस्सा मांगने की बात कर रहे हैं। एक तरफ वर्षों से आसाम का आन्दोलन जिस में साम्प्रदायिक शक्तियां बराबर काम कर रही हैं, और आज तक सरकार समस्या का समाधान निकालाने में विफल रहे हैं तथा दूसरी तरफ इस देश के करोड़ों लोगों के साथ अन्याय और दुर्व्यवहार हो रहा है, रात-दिन कत्ल हो रहे हैं, गांव के गांव जाति और छुआछूत के नाम पर खाली करवा दिए जाते हैं, दिन दहाड़े हरिजन आदिवासियों को गोलियों से भून दिया जाता है। पिछले दो द्वाइ सालों में जिस तरह से हरिजन आदिवासियों को तबाह किया

गया है, उनका कत्लेआम किया गया है, वह भी इस देश के लिए बड़ा खतरा है। 35 साल की आजादी के बाद आज भी लोग न्याय पाने के इन्तजार में बैठे हुए हैं। मैं संविधान निर्माताओं के समक्ष यह खतरा मौजूद था, वे जानते थे कि आजादी के बाद यह खतरा आ सकता है इसलिए उन्होंने आर्टिकल (15) में Prohibition of discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth के एवोल्यूशन की बात की थी कि इन इन बुनियादों पर इस देश में संविधान लागू होने के बाद डिस्क्रिमिनेशन नहीं हो सकेगा लेकिन क्या वह डिस्क्रिमिनेशन समाप्त हो सका है? आज राजनीतिक नेताओं तथा पार्टियों, सभी की एक शैली बन गई है। नाकिरियों में जाति और धर्म का आधार चलता है बल्कि इस सदन में आने में भी इन चीजों को इस्तेमाल किया जाता है। क्या इस सदन में आने के लिए राजनीतिक पार्टियां धर्म का इस्तेमाल नहीं करती हैं?

एक तरफ अगर इस देश के लोग हिन्दू धर्म के ठकेदारों से परेशान होकर अपना धर्म परिवर्तन करते हैं तब हिन्दू धर्म के ठकेदारों का यहां पर जो सम्मेलन हुआ जिसमें शंकराचार्य आए, उस सम्मेलन का मकसद यह लगता था कि इस देश के हरिजन इस्लाम धर्म में न जाएं लेकिन उनका मकसद हिन्दू धर्म के ठकेदारों से हरिजन आदिवासियों को बचाना बिल्कुल नहीं था।

इसमें उन धर्म विवाह की बात जो कही गई है उसका विरोध बनतबाला जी ने यहां पर किया। मैंने उनसे सवाल किया कि जब हरिजन धर्म परिवर्तन करके इस्लाम धर्म में जाते हैं तब आपको कैसा लगता है? हमारे धर्म परिवर्तन पर ये लोग तो खुश होते हैं लेकिन दूसरी तरफ हिन्दू धर्म के ठकेदार हमको धर्म परिवर्तन भी नहीं करने देते हैं। पॉलीटिकल पार्टियों के लोग कहते हैं कि विदेशी पैसों के आधार पर धर्म-परिवर्तन हो

[श्री जगपाल सिंह]

रहा है। यहां पर राज्य मंत्री बैठे हुए हैं, मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यदि यह बात सही है तो वे पता लगाकर बताएं कि कौन कौन सी विदेशी शक्तियां हरिजननों को पैसा देकर धर्म परिवर्तन करवा रही हैं? क्योंकि हरिजन आदिवासियों ने आर्ययज्ञ के समय में भी धन या सत्ता के लालच में आकर धर्म परिवर्तन नहीं किया था फिर आज यह कैसे सम्भव है?

अन्त में मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि आर्टिकल (17) में अनटर्चीबिलिटी को समाप्त करने की बात कही गई थी लेकिन यह कंठ बढ़ता ही जा रहा है। आज इसके लिए जो पार्टी सत्ता में है वह सबसे ज्यादा जिम्मेदार है। आज अनटर्चीबिलिटी को समाप्त करने के लिए जो ऐक्ट बना हुआ है उसके अन्तर्गत धानों में जो रिपोर्ट लिखाई जाती है क्या उनमें किसी भी छूआछूत बरतने वाले को आप सजा दिला पाए हैं? इसमें असफलता का कारण यह है कि आपकी जो ब्यूरोक्रेसी और पुलिस है वह हायर कम्युनिटी की है। इसीलिए आर्टिकल (17) का मकसद पूरा नहीं हुआ है बल्कि यह चीज बढ़ती ही जा रही है। आर्टिकल (25), (26), (27) और (28) जोकि राइट टू फ्रीडम आफ रिलिजन से संबंधित है उनकी भी आज इतनी भूमात्मक स्थिति हो गई है जिससे समाज में अस्थिरता आई है।

आर्टिकल (26) के सम्बन्ध में मैं खास तौर से कहना चाहूंगा कि संविधान में हरिजन, आदिवासी और वीकर संवर्षण के शैक्षिक और आर्थिक हितों की जो बात कही गई है वह भी पूरी नहीं हुई है। आज भी करोड़ों हरिजन आदिवासी उसी स्थिति में जंगलों में रह रहे हैं जिसमें कि सैंकड़ों वर्ष पहले थे। उनके पास पीने के पानी नहीं है, उनके पास पहनने के लिए कपड़ा नहीं है, रोजगार नहीं है, जमीन नहीं है, जायदाद नहीं है, उनके पास कोई साधन नहीं है, शिक्षा के लिए स्कूल नहीं है, अस्पताल नहीं है — ऐसी स्थिति में आप लोग जब तक कोई आर्थिक प्रोग्राम वीकर-संवर्षण के लिए नहीं देंगे और सामन्तवाद पर चोट नहीं करेंगे, तब तक इस समस्या का समाधान नहीं होने वाला है। कास्टिज्म

और अनटर्चीबिलिटी — ये सारी की सारी चीजें सामन्तवाद की दो हुई हैं। आप पूंजीवाद समाज की तरफ बढ़ रहे हैं, लेकिन लग रहा है कि पूंजीवाद और सामन्तवाद का आपस में कोलाबोरेशन हो गया है।

17.01 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

सामन्ती शोषण इस देश के अन्दर बरकरार रहने चाहिये, अगर सामन्तीशोषण खत्म हो गया तो इस देश का पूंजीवाद यहां के लोगों को खून चूस कर आगे नहीं बढ़ पाएगा। इसलिए मैं अपील करूंगा कि आप इन पर सबसे ज्यादा चोट कर सकते हैं और चोट भी एक तरीके से जातिवाद, छूआछूत, पिछड़ापन — ये सब सामन्ती अवशेष हैं, जिन्हें खत्म किए बिना आप सोसायटी को आगे नहीं ले जा सकते हैं। यह बात मैं तब समझूंगा जब आप सेना से जाति के नाम पर खर्च हुए रोजीमेंट्स खत्म करेंगे, क्योंकि जाति के नाम पर रखे हुए रोजीमेंट्स भी सामन्ती अवशेष हैं और सरकार को अपने बल से सेना से इन सामन्ती नाम के रोजीमेंट्स को खत्म करना चाहिए। मैं एक बात यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाइना हमसे दो साल पहले आजाद हुआ। उस मूलक के अन्दर भी सब प्रालम्ब्य थी — जातिवाद, अन्धविश्वास और विदेशी शक्तियां भी उस देश के अन्दर घुस चुकी थीं, लेकिन उन सब के खिलाफ लड़ते हुए उसने अपने समाज के अन्दर बुराई पैदा नहीं होने दी। उन्होंने सामाजिक बुराइयों से लड़कर चाइना सोसायटी को आगे बढ़ाया। मानव शोषण को खत्म किया है। इसलिए मैं अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि यह बुनियादी काम हिन्दूस्तान के सामन्तवाद और लैड रिफार्म के द्वारा आप कर सकते हैं। अपनी ब्यूरोक्रेसी के रिफार्म के द्वारा आप कर सकते हैं। इन्हीं पर आप चोट कर सकते हैं। दूसरा रास्ता नहीं है। इस देश के अन्दर 52 प्रतिशत हरिजन और आदिवासियों, माइनॉरिटीज लोगों का प्रतिनिधित्व है, लेकिन आप उनको बराबर प्रतिनिधित्व देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। 35 साल की आजादी के बाद भी आप शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स का सर्विसज में

secular outlook
in the country.

रिजॉलेशन है उस को भी आप पूरा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। तो कैसे आप समानता लायेंगे, कैसे धर्म में एकता पैदा करेंगे। माननीय बाजपेयी जी बैठे हुए हैं, मैं उनसे अपील करूंगा कि यदि आप हिन्दू धर्म को बचाना चाहते हैं, तो हिन्दू धर्म को अन्दर जो शोषणकारी और दमनकारी प्रवृत्तियाँ पैदा हो रही हैं, उनके खिलाफ जब तक आप नहीं लड़ेंगे, तब तक आप हिन्दू धर्म को नहीं बचा सकते हैं। हिन्दू धर्म को बचाना है तो सब धर्मों की बराबर समानता की भावना इस देश को अन्दर पैदा करके इस देश की एकता को बचा सकते हैं। अपने-अपने धर्मों को बचाने के लिए जरूरी है कि मानव के शोषण को आप खत्म करें। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात कह कर आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए समय दिया।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri K. Arjunan. We have only half an hour more for this Resolution. At 3.30, we had extended the time of this Resolution by two hours because this is a very important Resolution. After this speaker, there are many more speakers who want to speak on this resolution. What is the consensus of the House? The Minister has got to intervene. There are 4-5 speakers and the mover of the Resolution will also reply. The mover as well as the Minister will take at least 30 minutes.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUB-BAIAH): It is not possible.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Then we have got to extend the time because some more speakers are there. I do not want to deprive anybody. So, we extend the time by one more hour.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRA-BORTY: What will happen to the next motion?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your priority is safe. It is not lost because of the extension of time of this Resolution rules are very clear.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Rule 9-A empowers him to take it up next time. Your priority is safe.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRA-BORTY: Then it is all right.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your priority is safe. You need not worry.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Will it last up to 6 p.m.?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It will last up to 6 p.m. The second Resolution will be taken up after the first.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA): Then, I can go now, I have to attend a Cabinet meeting.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can go. Now, Shri Arjunan please.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: According to Direction 9-A he can move it next time. That is not lost. Rules are there.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRA-BORTY: If it is on record we are safe.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Rules are clear. It is on record. Now, Mr. Arjunan, please.

*SHRI K. ARJUNAN (Dharmapuri): Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am very happy to participate in the discussion on the hon. Member Shrimati Vidya Chennupati's Resolution directing the Government of India to take immediate steps to establish a casteless and secular society in India. I am very glad that my Party Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam's soul-force is the contents of this Resolution and this House has got the opportunity to discuss it

[Shri K. Arjunan]

in great depth. It is my privilege to take part in this debate as a person who has himself done inter-caste marriage.

I would like to repeat again that social reform is the basic tenet which Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam has adopted. Its mentor Perarignar Anna found this concept of ONE AND ONLY CASTE AND ONE GOD. The Government's policy is the achievement of economic equality first and then social reforms will follow in its wake. I am sorry that this is just day dream only. I have to point out with all the force at my command that social forms alone will bring in the economic advancement. Today the DMK has grown to such great heights in Tamil Nadu just because of its unassailable faith in this concept. The D.M.K. Government in Tamil Nadu gave the legislative authority for inter-caste marriages, which form the seed-bed for casteless society. Here it is worth mentioning that after names there should be no caste appellations.

I am sorry to say that even today the advanced community people, the religious protagonists and the women of upper castes continue to believe in such superstitions and beliefs. It is strange that the ideas of Thanthai Periyar and Perarignar Anna have been accepted and honoured by backward classes, scheduled castes and others. They are trying to follow them in their day to day life also. But the advanced communities have not accepted these revolutionary concepts beneficial for the good of society. They exploit the caste distinctions and religions denominations for subjugating socially 80 per cent of the society, the scheduled castes, the scheduled tribes and the backward classes. It is really an irony that when the country is being ruled by a distinguished woman, the women of the country perpetuate their faith in superstitious beliefs.

Our hon. Prime Minister has been giving legislative strength to many progressive economic concepts and ideas. Yet, the social problems have not been resolved so far. We have the Indian Penal Code, Cr. P.C. etc. Yet the crimes continue unabated. I refer to the inability

of laws in bringing about social changes. Social changes can be brought about by ceaseless preaching, as was done by Perarignar Anna, Thanthai Periyar and presently Dr. Kalaignar Karunanidhi. By continuous campaign against social ills, we will be able to bring about necessary changes in the mental outlook of the people at large. By transforming the mental outlook alone, we will be able to establish casteless society in the country.

Even today our school text books refer elaborately to Vedas, Upanishads, Puranas etc. It is strange that the nation's history books also refer to the man's imaginary inventions like Vedas and Puranas. By dinning into the ears and minds of our younger generation these esoteric events of our Puranas, particularly in this scientific age when man has reached moon, we are only taking them back to dark ages. We are doing great damage to the society as a whole by such unnecessary references in our text books. In the syllabi of our colleges and Universities, there should be a course on Casteless and Secularism. In fact, each University should have a Chair to this study. The students should be encouraged to prepare thesis for their Ph.D on castelessness and secularism. Then only we will be leaving lasting values for our posterity. We should stop teaching them about *Leelas* of Lord Krishna, Lord Shiva and other Gods.

The mover of this Resolution has talked about incentives to be given to the employees of public sector industries and of Government, who take to intercaste marriage. I welcome it, but I will go a step further.

I would say that only those professing and practising faith in castelessness and secularism should be chosen for becoming Members of State Legislatures and the Parliament. It should be the first qualification of a politician. My leader Dr. Kalaignar Karunanidhi is the beacon light in this matter. He has taken a girl from a scheduled caste for his son. She has become the honoured member of this great family. The teachings of Thanthai Periyar, Perarignar Anna and Dr. Kalaignar Karunanidhi, particularly the true life-

style of our leader Karunanidhi, have inspired men like me to go in for intercaste marriage. The Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam has not wavered an inch from the teachings of the great social reformers—Thanthai Periyar and Arignar Anna. Prof. Ranga, the teacher of Arignar Anna, paid glowing tributes to Thanthai Periyar and he said that this discussion today in this House is the standing monument for the teachings of Thanthai Periyar. I was moved to tears when I heard this from the Deputy Leader of the Congress (I) Party in this House. But I could not accept his reference to AIADMK, as the sister-party of D.M.K. Today the ruling party in Tamilnadu seeks the blessings of Kanchi Sankaracharya. As was pointed out by my hon. friend Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty, such a ruling party depending upon God's dispensation for survival in power cannot usher in the era of egalitarian society in the country.

Today the ruling party in Tamil Nadu is paying lip sympathy to the teachings of Thanthai Periyar and Arignar Anna. This is substantiated by the growing number of communal conflagrations taking place now in Tamil Nadu. In Puliangudi, Kanyakumari, Tirunelveli and Villupuram, the communal conflicts have taken heavy toll of life and property. There is no law and order in Tamil Nadu. In these circumstances, the RSS which has taken deep roots in Kerala and in northern States and which has so far had no foothold in Tamil Nadu is exploiting the situation and is gaining ground in Tamil Nadu. It is the instigation of RSS that has been the source of all communal conflicts in Tamil Nadu. The of the situation by the AIADMK Government in Tamil Nadu has become a convenient handle for RSS to twist the situation in its favour. The communal forces, which are not good of the society, are gaining the upper hand.

My hon. friends, Shri Banatwalla, stated that the Muslims are worse than even Harijans in the country. Unless the Muslims take to social reforms, they will never be able to achieve economic prosperity. Swelling the temple funds is not going to solve the economic ills of the community

at large. Religious faith has also its limitations in bringing about social reforms.

Coming now to Elections, what do we find? Instead of choosing candidates on the merits of their service to the society, the political parties view with one another in choosing candidates of that particular caste, which is predominant in that area. Naturally that particular caste gets the upper hand. The cardinal principle in choosing the candidates for contesting the elections should be on the basis of his abiding faith in social reforms, and in fact should be one who has done intercaste marriage by himself. Then only we will be able to instill faith in the society. Whatever may be our economic achievements, we find the Akali Dal, the Jamat-i-Islam, the RSS, the Shankaracharyas gaining strength in the country. One need not say that they are all the spring-boards of communal conflicts. They are not interested in economic advancement. They want to perpetuate their hold on society. In this environment we will not be able to achieve castelessness and secularism in the country.

Before I conclude, I would say that through social reforms alone we will be able to ensure social equality. The economic reforms will strengthen that social equality. Though we have been giving all kinds of incentives to the scheduled castes and harijans, we have not yet been able to bring all of them on the mainstream of nation's life. The reason for that is we have not strengthened the roots by implementing effectively first the social reforms. Economic equality follows in the footsteps of social equality. We must work for this goal. With these words I conclude my speech.

SHRI S. B. SIDNAL (Belgaum): Sir, when I saw this Resolution, it brought me mixed feelings, pleasure and pain—pain, because even after Independence, 35 years have elapsed, but we could not achieve anything in this line; pleasure, because my sister Member brought this subject kindly.

Sir, This can be seen from life of Mahatma Gandhi who wanted to build a casteless society in the country. At least

[Shri S. B. Sidnal]

we have to remember those people who practised, even our leader Indirajit, who never preached, but practised. All her children have married from different castes and communities, even international. And my friends on the other side while preaching this, themselves politicalised this problem. It is not a political problem. The hon. Member there has professed to divest politics from religion, but he did not do it very much. Sir, this is a very important subject and this should be taken very seriously not only by one section or one religion, but by all religions and all nations. Unless we build a casteless society, we cannot build a strong nation because economic power is not the only factor to build a strong country, but we have to create a just society. To create a just society we have to think relatively of the impact it has got on the present generation. Unfortunately we cannot practise now, but we can ask our children to practise and let it come from the top level, that is, from the high society. My friend is telling only to us. I appeal to him that he should also practise what he preaches.

In this country the community many a time has become a capital for politics, for business and for other things. A doctor, or a lawyer, or a teacher—he never bothers when a client comes, from some other community or his own community, when a patient comes from his own community or some other community. For money transaction there is no community, for profit there is no community, no caste, but for other things we always look to the caste. If we do not change the society now, if we do not change the present generation of the society now, it will create a bad impact on the succeeding generations, it will endanger our nation. We have already had partition in that regard. This was the only root cause which has resulted in partition.

About the three-point programme of Mrs. Vidya to promote a sense of castelessness through inter-caste and inter-religious marriages, I have seen many friends of mine who have married from outside their communities. Leave apart promotion or

incentives, actually there is no appreciation, actually they have not been given a house in that particular lane. So much of ill-treatment we have towards those people who go in for marriages outside their community. Why? When are we going to change this? What is the base, what is the instrument, what are the tools available to us to improve the society and the country at large? In my opinion education is the basic thing, even right from pre-primary to the top. Unless we start from the very beginning, that is, casteless society with the young and tender minds, we cannot hope to improve anything by platform speeches or any kind of literature that is produced. But it should come. Forget that we cannot improve without mental reservation. At least we must start with the succeeding generation. Free primary education literature should be produced by the Government because Governments responsible to create so many things. We do not hesitate and Congress has been known for being casteless. I do not agree with an hon. Member who accused Congress unnecessarily. It is only Congress where no caste is seen and where community is not accounted for. Outside in society—in clubs, in institutions, in Rotaries, Lions, in so many social institutions caste becomes the primary part for admission and it is practised in so many garbs. Is it not a shame on the part of our society? Foreigners look and laugh at us when we practise all these things. Great Mahatma Gandhi preached this to the whole world. Even King Martin Luther, John F. Kennedy and many people followed him. But none of us follow him and practise. It is most unfortunate. Therefore, in my opinion, this inter-caste marriage must be appreciated, promoted. Incentive should be given by the Government. It is one of the factors by which society can be changed. By legislation we cannot improve. Nothing can be done by imposition. Nothing can happen unless the mind, the basic structure of society is changed. We have to be receptive. To achieve such a thing we cannot be helped by law. Criminal procedure, Hindu Law, Muslim Law could not put an end to all wrongs. Laws are meant to prohibit all wrongs but we have not been able to control through

legislation. For this there has to be proper education. Therefore, I would like to say:

"Prepare suitable text-books to promote secular ideals by laying emphasis on fundamental duties enshrined in the Constitution."

Right from the days of our Constitution till to-day leaders from all sections have been teaching and preaching. They speak but they never practise. So, I appeal to the House, irrespective of political parties we should promote inter-caste marriages. It is a beautiful idea. Unless blood comes together change will not take place. After inter-caste marriage the only caste or community will be nothing but nationality. Unless this is done, there will not be nationality. When we lose nationality, we lose everything. To achieve this we have to prepare text books. We have to bring about this change through education.

We have to bring about this change through film, through press and through all means at our command. We have to start at least from to-day and we can achieve something.

"Encourage secular outlook among the employees working in Government and public sector undertakings."

I quite appreciate this. This is very good proposal that secular outlook should be encouraged among the employees working in public sector undertakings and in government or even working in private institutions. Incentive should be given by way of promotion or if anybody is proved on evidence doing otherwise he should be dismissed. Negatively also we should deal with him. Fanning casteism or communalism inside and outside should be discouraged totally. Incentive in the form of promotion, in the form of giving appointments to someone, in the form of social status, et. should be definitely planned out.

In our country still the Harijans are being ill-treated. We read it in many newspapers. The foreigners always laugh at us. They ask us who are the Harijans and why atrocity is committed on them? Even right from the beginning the tradition in this country is we love dogs, cats

and animals. But why we have never been able to love human beings? Have we never been taught to love human beings? Who is our own brother, who is part of our own blood. Therefore, Sir, it should be promoted and taken care of by all sections of the society and debates should be conducted in schools and colleges and public institutions and competition should be held at national level. A national forum should be constituted to preach this out of Members of Parliament or whatever the wisdom is available with us.

Lastly, I am very sorry to say that all religious heads irrespective of this religion or that, they preach—there is no prohibition under the Constitution to preach their religion and community—their own community feelings and of late they are harming the society. They are going to preach against another community. We are not going to live and let live. This is the passion of the day. I appeal to the religious heads also to change themselves basically and not to offend another community. First, we must be a nationalist. First, we must become a good citizen of this country then only religion or anything comes in. Therefore, in my humble opinion, I appeal to every section and every political party not to politicise this issue. This is above politics and above personal interest. Therefore, in my humble opinion, of late, the communal zealots are damaging the position and image of the country inside and outside. If a real nationalist just visualize the state of affairs and the problem, the blood boils. What for we are here? What are the achievements? When we go to a hospital, we see many hundreds of children. If you mix there, can you find a caste? It is all our own creation. We baptise them; we teach them. I am sorry to bring to the notice of the House, everybody knows about it, even many schools and educational institutions are born in this country out of religion. I do not mind. I do not mistake if they preach. But they are only brain-washing the children at the tender age. They ask the children to go in a particular way. When the child is not properly taught, when the child is not properly broad-based, is not properly educated, is not properly

[Shri S. B. Sidnal]

conditioned to become a good citizen of this country, what we can expect in this country in the future? The future is always for the youngsters and we have to start reforming immediately on war-footing and a nation-wide forum should be built and all religious heads should initiate this step and start teaching the casteless society.

Even in the films, many things are wrongly shown on the screen which have to be avoided. The Film Censor Board should be instructed not to permit any community feeling either in dialogue or anything like that.

Lastly, I would quote one film song.

तू हिन्दू बनेगा न मुसलमान बनेगा,

इन्सान की औलाद है इन्सान बनेगा ।

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barsat): Sir, I rise to support the Resolution. While supporting the Resolution, I would urge upon the mover of the Resolution that it would have been better had the scope of the Resolution been further widened and broadened.

As a matter of fact, I moved a resolution but I found that it did not reach in time. He did not give the consent to move the resolution. My attempt was to further broaden and widen the scope of this Resolution. If you allow me, I will move at this stage. But I do not insist.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You give a separate resolution. We will consider.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: That depends on ballot. The ballot is not favouring me these days. You can help me.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is something wrong with your stars.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Anyway, this is an appropriate resolution and it is of extreme relevance to the existing political situation in our country today.

The mover of the resolution has rightly emphasized upon two basic issues, namely, the castelessness and the promotion of secularism. My only grouse in this respect is that while she has emphasized or pinpointed upon these two aspects—

it is more or less a social aspect of the problem—I do not know why she has not taken into account the economic and political factors behind this problem. This is, according to me, the main lacuna or the main weakness of the resolution although the spirit of the resolution is laudable and it deserves support from all sections of the House. She has already won the congratulations from all the members who have spoken on the subject.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You know Mr. Gora who was a great rationalist. She is the daughter of Mr. Gora.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, as regards the question of secularism, please allow me to say the truth. Our Government claims that it is a secular State. Is that claim really justified? It is a non-theocratic State; it is not a theocratic State. But just not being a theocratic State does not automatically mean that it is a secular State. Our conception of secularism is that of an antidote to theocracy. As Pakistan is a theocratic State and as Bangladesh is a theocratic State, we have not declared our State as a theocratic one and therefore, to say that we are secular is a wrong notion. It is an unscientific notion; it is not a clear or a correct concept of secularism. Secularism, according to me, is not only a concept. It is the practice of separating religion from the State. On the other hand, in the name of secularism, our Government, to speak most liberally, is to treat all religions equally or to give equal treatment and equal encouragement to all religions.

The basic concept and basic norm of secularism, as I have already underscored, is the complete separation of religion from the State and its functions. Unfortunately, that is not the practised today by the Government. My hon. friend, Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty illustrated certain things. It is quite well-known that there are many State functions to which particular religious functions are also associated. Even in this Parliament House we find something where there is no enough exhibition of secularism. We find certain scrips from certain religions only. All religions are not equally

respected even in the premises of the Parliament. The point is that the concept of secularism is to be understood and the concept of secularism is the complete separation of religion from the State. The State is not to be religious, not to be irreligious. It is merely to be separated and its functions should remain exclusively separate from the religion. This is my first point.

There are trends of communal politics which is the greatest enemy to the concept of secularism. Two trends are very prominent now.

One is that there is a trend that there should be Hindu Rashtra.

There is another trend which is equally dangerous....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your idea is that religion cannot control. So also, State can control religion. Am I right?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: State is completely....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: State controls religion.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: That is a theocratic State.

There are two trends which I was mentioning. There is a trend and that trend is unfortunately growing that Hindus being the majority, there should be Hindu Rashtra.

Equally, there is another dangerous trend of communal politics that Muslim is a separate nation. Therefore, Indian Muslims constitute a separate nation.

These are the two broad trends of communal politics. And these two trends are equally inimical to the basic concept of secularism. It is the duty of all of us, particularly, the mover of the resolution, to pinpoint, to highlight, this point. Pronouncing the word 'secularism' and repeating it like a parrot, is not secularism, unless it is practised. It is necessary for the Government to frame a complete

guidelines, to practice secularism. In that case, my friend Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty can also be of help to the Hon. Home Minister.

I admit that caste system in India is a historical one. We do not just push it up. It will be wrong to push it up. There are historical reasons for it. If I may sum up, the reason is the continuous uninterrupted reliance on caste-based village communities and relatively slow growth of the means of production and the mode of production.

That is the basic reason which generated the caste system and that caste system and the caste stratification remain today which was blurred about 3,000 years ago.

The major danger of casteism is that on the basis of this caste consideration, economic hierarchy and political hierarchy have been built up. That is the danger. The danger is not that some people are divided into certain castes and some people have been divided into certain compartments. But the danger is that there has been political and economic hierarchy on the basis of casteism.

As a matter of fact, my respected and esteemed friend the mover to the resolution, has not really hinted the basic issue of casteism. If we are to have castelessness, we have to break that economic and political hierarchy built up on the basis of casteism.

Are you prepared to do that? Unless you are prepared to do it, casteism will remain. Castelessness will remain far removed.

There are political parties this side also, of course, which take a very simplistic view of a casteless class in Indian context. They say caste is class. Caste struggle is class struggle. Therefore, class problem can be solved only in the street. This is wrong. This is not only erroneous, it is divisive. It is not only divisive, it is antagonistic to the concept of class struggle. From our side, concept is also to be combated.

[Shri Chitta Basu]

As a matter of fact, casteism, the caste division, caste hierarchy, based on political and economic considerations, can be liquidated only by intensification of class struggle. The advocates of casteism want to divide the exploited, the people belonging to different castes and sub-castes. Therefore, if we have to build up a feeling of brotherhood, these major economic and political issues cannot be shunned. It is a great surprise to me that you want to solve this basic problem by shunning away, by keeping yourselves away, from major, basic and fundamental political and economic issues. This is the basic weakness—I do not say 'lacuna'. This is due to the fact that our esteemed Mover of the Resolution, I feel, did not really give a proper thought to the basic problem. However, whatever she has suggested is laudable and I and all of us here support this.

The basic question she has raised is the question of education. In this context I want to refer only to one aspect of education, and that is history. History books based on falsified and distorted reports are now included in the curriculum. As a matter of fact it should be the task of every one of us who wants national integration or national brotherhood to see that the history books are re-written. Our history books carry mystified events and reports; they should be de-mystified. Our history has been interpreted as merely a history of war between this king and that emperor. They have forgotten that even in India, there was a struggle between the forces of progress and the forces of conservatism in all aspects of life; in philosophy, in science, in technology, in religion, in all aspects of life, there was a struggle of the progressive forces against the forces of reaction or conservatism. Therefore, what is needed most is a popular history book depicting the actual history as a process of unfolding the developments in our society based on the struggle of forces representing progress and conservatism. I think, the hon. Mover of this Resolution will agree that a new curriculum of education can be prepared only on the basis of a re-written history

of India because some of our communal politicians say that Hindus and Muslims are irreconcilable because they represent the two opposites and, therefore, there cannot be any amity or harmony between the two major communities, the Hindus and the Muslims—because history teaches us so! If you really want to have communal harmony and amity, history has to be re-written in a way which can prove that the Hindus and the Muslims are not the opposites and that they can remain together, they can work together, they can toil together, they can fight together, they can sacrifice their lives together for a common cause.

Lastly, about forum. Some of our friends were mentioning about the forum. Sir, there is a forum, the National Integration Council, of which I happen to be a member. But my charge against the Government is that the National Integration Council never meets when the situation calls for it. We are not given a chance to express our views on important issues like Khalistan. The National Integration Council has been shelved; it is shelved when communalism rises. If you really want a forum where we can work for promotion and strengthening of secularism, strengthening and reinforcing national integration, forums are available. But the forums are not activated because they feel that if there is national integration, if there is a real sense of secularism and if there is communal harmony and amity, I think, they may ultimately lose politically. Therefore, they are not also enthusiastic not only to spread the idea of secularism but to create a forum and make it function for such laudable objects. With these words I hope the entire House will support this resolution and I also support the resolution.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hamirpur): The mover of the resolution has done a commendable thing by focussing attention on some of the most important problems that need our attention to-day. She herself is eminently qualified to move this resolution because she has set an example and her father also has set an example. Her sister's inter-caste marriage was agreed to and blessed by Gandhiji and it was to be held on the 22nd February 1948 but, unfor-

tunately, Gandhiji died on the 30th January and so the marriage was blessed by our first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru. So, in that spirit, having set an example herself of castelessness and inter-caste marriage—and her father set a blaze in this tradition—she has put forward the resolution before the House and I am very happy that all sections of the House are supporting it.

The sense of secularism, to my mind, is different from irreligiousness and I would take it in the spirit that it would bring in our mind a sense of respect for all religions because religion in our country has been a part of history and to blot out every achievement of religion would only be—you can say—giving a diminutive stature to history itself. There is no harm in paying glowing tributes to Gautam Buddha, Kabir, and Guru Nanak and to hundreds of such saints and seers who have spoken against the caste. There were no Parliaments in those days. There was not much of a Press, and communication was not there. But it was through the songs, sayings, proverbs, hymns and the preachings of these saints and seers which could travel from one part of India to another that the message of castelessness, the message of equality of man, the message of brotherhood of man was preached. Therefore, whenever the forces of fanaticism raised their ugly head, it was the presence of these important men who came on the scene that ensured the protection of secularism, the basic and fundamental duties of one man towards another and of the man towards society, so on and so forth. So I do not feel ashamed of the role of religion in its entirety though there are some blots and there may be many blots but to condemn all religions altogether and all religions altogether at once and at one stroke would be doing injustice. Therefore, to say that in a secular State religion has no place and that there should be a complete vacuum, that the State should operate as a State and religion should operate as a religion separately is not possible. Some inter-action has to take place and the good points of one can inspire good points in another.

In our own country, great stalwarts like Mahatma Gandhi have preached the concept of *Sarva Dharma Samabhava* that is putting the good points of all religions together. Some of these seers have even given us a common book of prayers. Look at the book of prayers which was used by people at Gandhiji's ashram. If anybody goes through that book, he can hardly find sense of communalism in that book. You have the gems from all religions. Therefore, that is also an approach. It is one approach to have tolerance, respect and it is quite another to ignore everything. I would prefer the former one and there are many religious preachers who have preached against castes, who have preached against high and low and who have preached against untouchability.

There were eminent men and women who have preached social reform. Think of Savitri of Maharashtra who blazed the trail for women's education. Think of the man like her husband who suffered over this cause and so on and so forth. There are countless men in all parts of the country who had to suffer simply because they initiated social reform. So, these are good things; these are parts of our heritage and when the mover talks of education, that would mean that we cull out the gems from the dark pages of history as they are not noticed by our children to-day and put them forward before the eyes of the children so that in the class rooms of schools and colleges, they learn the lessons of equality, they learn the lessons of brotherhood through the Indian context and through the Indian conditions and are able to feel proud that among them are their forefathers who have been men of religion and who have defied the society, who fought orthodoxy, who fought against the dogmatism in the days of the past and such deeds continue to-day and we must try to formulate set certain policies and set certain examples for the future.

Similarly, Sir, she talked about national integration which is a very important thing and our friends, on that side, had accused our party of fomenting casteism and communalism forgetting that it is the Indian National Congress of Gandhi and

[Prof Narain Chand Parashar]

Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose which has recently made possible the election to this highest office of the country, of a man, belonging to the backward community, a minority community. This is a glowing tribute.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: At that time, all of them were in the Indian National Congress.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR: They should not forget their parents. That is our trouble. So, we have been able to do that... (Interruptions) There have been seven Presidents. Gyani Zail Singh Ji is the Seventh President. There were two Presidents earlier—Dr. Zakir Husain and Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed who belonged to the minority community. It was the Indian National Congress which made it possible and it is again the Indian National Congress which is making it possible. We stand by our pledge, which we took under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, of eradicating casteism and communalism and of supporting the cause of Indian nationalism through national integration.

Our friend, Mr. Basu, has made certain remarks about the National Integration Council. It is not through the Government forum alone that we can work; the society has to move and work; the country has to be built up not by the institution set up by Government alone. Who prevents us from setting up private forums or Parliamentary forums, social forums, for espousing this cause? We, as individuals, should come forward and not lean upon the States for this noble objective. We should set an example ourselves. When Subhash Chandra Bose

existed, the people of Punjab did not think that he was a Bengali but he was admired as a man who sacrificed his all for the Indian National Army. There were people from Himachal, from Gujarat, from Assam, from Tamilnadu who sacrificed their lives for the cause of the Indian freedom. That was the real national integration and, through that spirit, we can make India a place our dreams which Gandhi Ji wanted to make and which Indira Ji wants to make.

With these words, I support this Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Madhukar,

श्री कमला मिश्र मधुकर (मोतिहारी) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपनी बात से पराशर साहब की बातों को दृष्टि में रखते हुए शुरू करूंगा। ठीक बात है - महात्मा गांधी ने धर्म-समभाव की आवाज उठाई थी, लेकिन उन्हीं महात्मा गांधी की प्रीचरज पर चलने वाले उन के चेलों की आज क्या हालत है? आज उन के देश में क्या हो रहा है - बिहार के फूलवारीशरीफ, बिहार-शरीफ, जमशेदपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश के मुरादाबाद में तथा देश के अनेक भागों में दंगों की भरमार है...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Madhukar, you may continue your speech next time. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, July

19, 1982.

18.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the clock on Monday, July 19 1982|Asadha 28, 1904 (Saka).