

[Dr. Saradish Roy]

wages to the workers on the basis of norms laid down by the Fifteenth Indian Labour Conference."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This House expresses its grave concern at the falling real wages of the Indian workers consequent to the abnormal rise in prices of essential commodities and failure of the Government to grant need-based minimum wages to the workers on the basis of norms laid down by the Fifteenth Indian Labour Conference."

Now, Dr. Saradish Roy, you may please continue your speech on the next day, sometime when the subject comes up.

17.04 hrs.

# DISCUSSION RE. HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS BURIED WITH THE TIME CAPSULE AT THE RED FORT ON 15.8.1973

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now take up Discussion under Rule 193. Shri Sezhiyan. The time allotted is two hours.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाज (ग्वालियर)  
सभापति जी, मुझे एक निवेदन करना है। आप मानते हैं कि यह चर्चा उस कैपसूल के बारे में हो रही है जो 15 अगस्त को धरती के नीचे दबाया गया था। मेरे मित्र श्री सेझियान ने स्वीकर साहब को लिखा था, हम लोगों ने भी लिखा था कि एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर को कहें कि उस कैपसूल में क्या दबाया गया था उस का सारा विवरण सभा पटल पर रखें, मेम्बरो की दें जिस से हमें पता लग सके कि क्या दबाया गया है। अन्यथा अखबारों में जो कुछ छप चुकी है और जिस का सरकार की ओर से खंडन नहीं किया गया इस का मतलब यह हुआ कि वह सही है और जो चीज छपी वह सही है।

सकती है? यह सदन के प्राधिकारों का सवाल है और इस विषय में सार्वक चर्चा तब तक नहीं हो सकती जब तक सरकार यह न बताए अधिष्ठित रूप से कि उस कैपसूल में क्या रखा गया है? इतिहास का कोन सा पहलू पेश किया गया है? जो कुछ रखा गया है वह है क्या? क्या मंत्री महोदय का कहना यह है कि जो कुछ छपा है वह गलत है? या उन का कहना है कि हम बताएंगे नहीं क्योंकि बताने में देश की सुरक्षा को खतरा है? आखिर सदन को अंधेरे में कैसे रखा जा सकता है इस महत्वपूर्ण विषय के बारे में? मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस बारे में अपना मत दें।

श्री नवल किशोर शर्मा (दोसा) :  
सभापति जी, श्री वाजपेयी जी ने जिन मुद्दों पर आप का ध्यान आकषित किया है और यह मांग की है कि जो कैपसूल में रखा गया है उस का एथोराइज्ड वर्शन यहां पर पेश होना चाहिए, यह अपने आप में एक बड़ी अजीब सी बात है। आखिर कैपसूल को रखने का, गाड़ने का मतलब क्या है? अगर उस का मतलब यह है कि आज की दुनिया को, आज के लोगों को यह पता चले कि इतिहास कार क्या समझता है, इतिहासवेत्ता क्या समझते हैं आज की हालात के बारे में तो उस कैपसूल को गाड़ने का सवाल ही नहीं उठता। वह तो पारटैरिटी के लिए जो इतिहासकारों ने उचित समझा, वाजिब समझा उस को रखा गया है।

जैसी कि अखबारों की बात कही गई, अखबारों में तो एक नहीं अनेक चर्चाएं निकलती हैं, समाचार छपते हैं, अटकलें होती हैं, व्याख्याएं लिखी जाती हैं, राय लिखी जाती हैं, उन के आधार पर अगर सदन चलेगा और उन के आधार पर देश चलेगा तो इस से ज्यादा अजीब बात नहीं हो सकती। इसलिए मैं निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि यह चर्चा हो किसी मतलब की

नहीं है। यह सदन का समय वेस्ट करने वाली है। इस चर्चा को खत्म किया जाय। क्योंकि यह सही है कि जब तक उस का एथोराइज्ड वर्सन सदन के सामने नहीं होगा तब तक उस पर कोई कारगर चर्चा नहीं हो सकती और एथोराइज्ड वर्शन सामने आ नहीं सकता। इसलिए मेरी राय में इस पर चर्चा की गुंजाइश नहीं है।

**सभापति महोदय :** यह तो चर्चा आप की आज की कार्यवाही में आ गयी है। अगर नहीं करना था तो पहले दस के बारे में बिजनेस एंडबाइजरी कमेटी में वैसा निर्णय करना था। अब हम इसे कैसे बन्द कर सकते हैं ?

बाजपेयी जी ने जो कहा है अगर मैंने उन को ठीक से समझा तो उन्होंने कहा है कि माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय के सामने यह बात उठाई गई थी या लिख कर के उन्होंने दिया था कि सभा पटल पर रखा जाय। तो पहले मैं मंत्री महोदय की सुन लू कि उन को क्या कहना है ?

**THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN):** I would like to draw the attention of the House to the reply to a question that I gave on the 19th November, 1973 in this House. I said that:

"Within the limitation of its compass, it was designed to preserve an authentic record of our time for posterity. Having regard to this concept, the question of contemporaneous publication or laying the text of the documents on the Table of the House, does not arise."

Hon. Members wish to raise this discussion, and after they have made their submissions, I shall make my submissions to the House.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Beusarai):** On the basis of what the hon. Minister has said, I rise to a point of order,

(Interruptions)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I am giving time to everyone. Do not generate heat.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Bada-gara):** We should know what he is talking about.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** It will come in clear focus.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola):** Fortunately what he says is not going into the Capsule. He can go ahead.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** I know only untruth will go into the Capsule. This shows the depth of depravity to which the country is being sunk in every field. I demand the head of the Minister who is responsible for this (*Interruptions*). Do you understand what it means in parliamentary language? The hon. Minister has taken his stand in the reply that had been given earlier to a question. Precisely the reply to the question has been the cause for action so far as we are concerned. Therefore, we gave notice of this discussion.

The point to be considered is whether the Government wanted an authentic record to be handed down to posterity. The claim of the Government in reply to the question has been that it was so, So far as we have been able to learn from what has appeared in the newspapers, that it is not at all an authentic record: in fact, it is a perverted record. Then wherever is sought to be handed down to posterity cannot be kept secret. If they want any authentic history to be handed down to posterity, they should have left it to historians. Nobody is going to swallow the history prepared by this dishonest Government with the help of dishonest historical research (*Interruptions*). Nobody is going to swallow this. The Government is dishonest and corrupt.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** It should be withdrawn.

**PROF. S. NURUL HASAN:** I would like to say that the shouting and the lack of manner that he has always displayed is not going to unnerve us. He should

[Prof. S. Nurul Hasan]

not talk of historians in this vein. He can shout whatever he likes against me.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** It is not an authentic record (*Interruptions*) Nobody can prevent me from saying what I have said with regard to the Government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Unless you know the contents, how can you bring all these charges?

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:** We are asking for the contents.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** We are asking for the record. I will say this Government is corrupt and dishonest. It is corrupting historical research (*Interruptions*) Please hear me fully.

**सभापति महोदय :** वाजपेयी जी ने कहा है कि लोगों को डिमाण्ड है कि जो चीज कॅप्सूल में रखी गई हैं, उन को टेबिल पर रखिये । इस प्रश्न का निर्णय अगला महोदय करेंगे . . . .

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** These historians are stooges of the Government.

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** सभापति महोदय, इस में एक कठिनाई होगी । अगर इस निर्णय को स्वयं करेगा तो कॅप्सूल के बारे में समाचार-पत्रों में जो कुछ छपा है, हम उस को उद्धृत करेंगे—फिर मंत्री महोदय यह न कहें कि यह प्राथेनिक नहीं है ।

**सभापति महोदय :** वाजपेयी जी ने उठाया है कि यह अखबारों में पब्लिश हुआ है, उस का कन्ट्राडिक्शन सरकार की तरफ से नहीं हुआ है—या तो यह सही है या गलत है, इस का कन्ट्राडिक्शन पता चानिश्च । वाजपेयी जी ने जो चीज उठाई है, उस के बारे में बहुत से सदस्य अपनी स्वीच में बोलने वाले हैं, यह दो घण्टे की डिबेट है. इस में ये बात उठेगी और मंत्री महोदय उन का जवाब देंगे ।

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** I am raising a different point. You do not allow me to proceed.

**सभापति महोदय :** हम एलाऊ करेंगे—आप क्यों घबरा जाते हैं, क्यों नाराज होते हैं । अगर इस तरह से करेंगे तो हमारे जैसे ब्लड-प्रेसर के बीमार हो जायेंगे । मेहरबानी कर के आप को जो कुछ कहना है, कहिए, फिर उधर से भी दो-तीन सदस्य बोलने वाले हैं । . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha):** Sir, on a point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shri Mishra is also on a point of order. I have allowed him. (*Interruptions*) When there is already one point of order, how can there be another point of order?

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** It is about the manner of his speaking. He seems to have lost his temper. He says "damn it" and so on.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I will give you time. Do not waste the time of the House. I will call you.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** The point that I am seeking to make is that the Government cannot take the plea that this is meant to be secret.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** Is it a point of order? Under what rule?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Yes; because they are taking the plea that these things are meant to be kept as secret. (*Interruptions*) Sir, will you allow me to go on?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. Please go on.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Any historical document handed down to posterity cannot be kept secret. Egyptian history is recorded in Pyramids. Unless there is something shady about it, all history has to go down to posterity through the historians. (*Interruptions*) These things

cannot be kept secret. There is no purpose in keeping the history secret, which is going to be handed down to posterity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These points can be made by you in the course of the speech.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: This is dishonesty. Claiming to make a point of order and making a speech—that is dishonesty.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is a point that you may make while you are speaking. If you want time to speak, you speak and then make that point. The Minister will reply. That is not a point of order.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Is it meant to be secret? Can it be meant to be secret? (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can make that point in your speech.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: You know about it. These are facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sezhiyan.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam): Mr. Chairman. Sir, on the last Independence Day, a time capsule was buried at the historical Red Fort to leave for posterity a record of events connected with India's Independence, covering a period from August 15, 1947 to August 15, 1972. It is also reported that in the said time capsule, portraits of national leaders, micro-films of the Constitution and the Bhakra-Nangal project, and recordings of the speeches made in the Constituent Assembly on August 14-15th, 1947 have been put in the time capsule.

Sir, as demanded by my senior colleagues, Mr. Vajpayee and Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra, it would have been helpful if the Minister had come forward to publish the connected documents or to place them on the Table of the House. It would have been helpful for the Members of this House and the historians outside to get an authentic version;

but the Minister has not been obliging. It has been fully published in the Delhi weekly called Shakti, edited by our respected friend, Mr. M. L. Sondhi, who was a Member of this House, and published by Santhanam Trust.

It is true that while answering a question he has given the reply, which he has also quoted and which I have also got with me. He said:

"...Within the limitation of its compass, it was designed to preserve an authentic record of our time for posterity. Having regard to this concept, the question of contemporaneous publication, or laying the text of the documents on the Table of the House, does not arise."

I do not know why a document prepared by Government should be kept top secret for 5,000 years without being divulged to the contemporaneous audience here. In this respect, I can invite the attention of the Minister and of the House to the time capsule sunk in the United States in the year 1938—September, 1938—in the New York World Fair at the Flushing Meadows. Probably it was the first capsule sunk. It was made of cupaloy—copper alloyed with small amounts of chromium and silver—7½' long. It contained a microfilm carrying more than 10 million words and 100 articles of use in the industrial, social, cultural and day to day use. It contained a book of Bible and also a Book of Record telling the story of the time capsule and its contents. Copies of this book were circulated free to all the museums, libraries etc. throughout the world. I do not know what top secret of a confidential nature was there in our capsule. Perhaps something unprintable is there and that is why it is not being printed and circulated. That is the only conclusion we can come to.

I have a copy of the text *India since 1947* prepared by the Ministry and buried with the time capsule. I am going to authenticate it and lay it on the Table at the end of my speech.

[Shri Sezhiyan]

The minister said, he has already answered the question on 19th November 1973. Since then my half-hour discussion on that question was allowed and I wrote a very humble letter to the minister on 5th December requesting:

"I have been informed that there will be an half-an-hour discussion... I would request you to supply me well in advance a copy of the text of the documents placed in the Time Capsule for my use in regard to the proposed discussion."

On the same day there was a meeting of the business advisory committee and my half-an-hour discussion was converted into a discussion under Rule 193 for fuller discussion and participation by all parties. Then wrote the following letter to speaker the same day:

"Further to our discussion in the Business Advisory Committee meeting today, I am enclosing a copy of my letter of date to the Minister of Education... I request you to kindly direct the Minister to forward the text and have the stencilled copies circulated to the Members of the House for reference and use in the proposed discussion on the 7th December 1973."

My letter to the Minister has been ignored. I have not received any reply.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I have sent a reply yesterday. Maybe it has not reached the hon. member.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Does it take so much time for letters to travel from one place to another within Delhi?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I may not be a big man nor my party a big one in your books.

My party has been ignored in the Time Capsule and the future historian if in the record of this history.

he were to rely on the Capsule, may not know that there was a DMK Party. That may happen about 5000 years later. But now why do you ignore me in this House, an elected member? My humble appeal to all the members is this. I am looking at this question in a broader perspective. It is not a question of this party or that. The future historian is going to judge the entire working of parliamentary democracy in this country. Whether we sit on this side or that side is going to be immaterial. What kind of history are we going to give? My feeling is India deserves a better history. The future historian explorer who may tread on the Red Fort and pick up the capsule is going to be unfortunate, because he will be baffled by the contradictions and inconsistencies found in the report.

This question should be considered by everyone in this House irrespective of party affiliations, whether this is a desirable way of informing posterity about the conditions which were prevailing during the limited period 1947 to 1972. That is why I am approaching the subject more in anguish than in anger, more in sorrow than in spite. If at that time all other records are obliterated and we are going to be judged by this capsule history, there will be a poor picture, an untrue picture.

If in a distant future all the historical records are obliterated, and a person who comes into the scene 5,000 years later were to depend entirely on this capsule, he will find that there was a person called Mahatma Gandhi "who believed in non-violence." But from this record, he may not know that this apostle of peace was assassinated in January 1948. Since we are talking of the period 1947-72, is it not worthwhile to record the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi? Should we not say that this apostle of peace was done to death and that even while he was dying he was blessing the assassin with folded hands? But that does not find a place

For this recorded capsule the future historian will not be able to know that there was a person called Rajaji or Shri C. Rajagopalachari, the first Governor-General of this country, he will not be able to know that there was a person called Dr. Rajendra Prasad who was the first President of this country; he will be ignorant of the succeeding Presidents, Dr. Radhakrishnan, and Dr. Zakir Hussain; he will not be able to know, you will be surprised to find the name of Shri V. V. Giri as the President of India at the time of the blessed burial of this time Capsule. The future historian also will not know that there was a person called Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri who, though short in physical stature, was tall in his mental stature, who went all the way to Tashkent as a pilgrim of peace to establish peace in this part of the world. Don't you think that that name deserves to be inscribed in this record when we are dealing with historically significant events for the period of first twenty-five years of Indian independence.

When I read the whole text very carefully, I found that there are only seven names mentioned there. Before I mention the names, I want to make it very clear that for four of those names I have got the fullest of regard and they deserve a place in this limited record of history, and they are Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhbhai Patel and Shrimati Indira Gandhi. They deserve a place in this text and I am not going to contest that. But don't you think that the names of the Presidents of the Republic, starting from Dr. Rajendra Prasad and ending with Shri V. V. Giri also deserve some place in that capsule? When you have inscribed 10,000 words, could you not find some room to inscribe these names in that capsule? There are very many worthy names and significant events that deserve mention in this historical dissertation. Lest you may accuse that I am having a very narrow attitude, let me quote what the *Hindustan Times* says:

"After Independence, was not the assassination of Gandhi a major event? Was not Nambudiripad's communist

government in Kerala the first to come through the ballot, a significant event? Was not the challenge posed by the DMK in Tamil Nadu and the emergence of coalition governments in other States in 1967, a significant turning point in India's history in contrast to the monopoly over power the Congress enjoyed during Nehru's days? . . . Does not India since 1947 have a social structure? Is it not bursting with pronounced social changes? Don't we find the old caste structure crumbling and Indians of all castes doing business? Have not the social reformers like Ambedkar and E. V. Ramaswami Naicker (Periyar) made an impact on our social scene?"

Even the architect of the Indian Constitution, Dr. Ambedkar, does not find a place in his capsule.

Apart from these four persons, who had the honour of being inscribed in this capsule to be left for the posterity? Among those three names, the first is that of UN Mediator for Kashmir problem, Gl. MacNaughton. But the name of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, who went all the way to Tashkent in search of peace and died there, did not find a place in this capsule. Yet they have mentioned the name of Gl. MacNaughton, who came to mediate in the Kashmir aggression. The name of Avigrkar Annadurai who became the first DMK Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has been found not fit enough to be inscribed there. The rise of DMK is a significant event in the last 25 years. But his name has been completely ignored. It was not good enough because he happened to be an Indian. But about Sir Owen Dixon who came as the UN mediator, his name is honoured there.

The name of the third Mediator, Frank Graham has also been considered worthy for recognition in this historical text.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur): What are the other three names?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: General Mc. Naughton, Sir Owen Dixon and Frank Graham. All of them were three Mediators who came to settle the affairs of Kashmir, and very much against India.

If the history is to be read by person 5000 years later, there are some policy decisions inscribed there, I want to know from the hon. Members on the other side: Do they accept what is given in this text on the problem of Kashmir dispute?

After the names of these three persons have come in the text, there is a whole page devoted to Kashmir. There, it has been said:

"The question of plebiscite in Kashmir would not, from India's point of view, arise until this area is cleared by the U.N.O., of Pakistani troops."

Do you subscribe to this view that if Pakistani troops are cleared, you are prepared to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir? This is what the text of the Capsule says. Is that the stand taken in 1973 when this Capsule was put?

Then, there are many remarks made about political parties in this country....

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You are proceeding on the basis that it is the text of Capsule.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I am authenticating this context. If the Minister is bold enough, let him contract that. I am prepared to take any penalty or any censure that this House is ready to give me.

Here, very many political parties have been given unsavoury and questionable epithets. I will leave it to them to reply to these things. Happily, the D.M.K. has not been included in this one nor Mr. Kamraj. Probably, when the history was being written, they were not quite sure whether the D.M.K. enjoyed the good will of the Prime Minister and on which side Mr. Kamraj proposed to settle, so, both names have been left out. All other political parties have been taken to task in a very brusque way.

Our friend on left has been described as:

"Jan Sangh (Peoples' Party) is a militant orthodox Hindu party, opposing the concept of secular state..."

It is for him to reply to that.

Then, Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra's party has the honour of being mentioned as:

"Congress (Opposition) party—

—it is not Congress (Organisation) Party—

"...founded in 1968 after break with the All—India Congress of Indira Gandhi (the present Prime Minister), this party advocates a socialist programme in theory, but in practice, tends towards conservative policies favouring the upper and middle classes..."

That is a thing he has to reply.

Even Mr. H. N. Mukerjee's party has not been given a clean chit. That has been described as:

"a national democratic front of all patriotic forces, including workers peasants, intelligentsia....."

—afterwards comes the mud—

"...and the bulk of the non-mono-polistic bourgeoisie..."

That has also been included. It further says:

"this party aims at the non-capitalist growth of economic development and a socialistic democracy to be achieved by winning a stable majority in Parliament..."

I think, Karl Marx may well be turning in his grave if this is the objective of the Communist Party.

Even Congress (R) has been spared in this text. In the beginning of the para, they have paid a very glowing tribute to the Congress (R). They said:

"The most important among the national political Parties is the Indian National Congress which led the

country towards freedom and which stands for establishing a secular, democratic and socialist society in India."

Many of us were in the Congress, not in the post-1947 period, but even earlier. In 1942 I was in the Students' Movement braving the lathi-charge...

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Many of your partymen sided with the Britishers.

SHRI THA KIRUTTINAN (Sivaganga): No, no.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: no? Then you do not know the history of your own party. You are talking about patriotism?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I do not want to take the time of the House. I can reply to him in a better way.

I said that I was in that movement. If you want to challenge it, then challenge. D.M.K. was founded only in 1949. I cannot understand why Mr. Unnikrishnan is objecting to a paragraph which pays tributes to his party. "The most important among the national political parties is the Indian National Congress which led the country towards freedom"—this is the opening sentence. Then, you come to the next page. There it says:

"In this election (1971 elections) the Congress led by the Prime Minister Gandhi's group secured 352 seats, making a clear two-thirds majority."

If it has said that it is the Congress Party led by Mrs. Gandhi, it is a tribute to you. It does not say 'Congress Party led by Mrs. Gandhi', it says 'The Congress led by Mrs. Gandhi's Group', as if there is a coterie there above you and leading you. I do not think it is acceptable to any political party..

17.37 hrs.

[DR. SARADISH ROY in the Chair]

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): That is historical objectivity.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Sir, this document bristles with many contradictions, many falsified information and very many inconsistencies. Two or three, because I do not want to take the time of the House, I will mention.

Here is a publication of the Government of India—'India, 1973' available in print and available to everybody who can pay for it. It is not a top secret document. There also, it has given a retrospect for the last 25 years. On the opening page itself it says:

"All these gigantic tasks were taken up simultaneously after the Independence and the resources of the infant State were geared to the task of providing homes and work to over nine million persons who had crossed into the country in search of security and a new life."

After Independence, nine million people came as refugees into this country and it proved a hard task for the infant State to settle them. That is what "India 1973" describes in its 25 years' retrospect. You take this text that is kept in the capsule to be read after 5000 years. There it is said:

"Secondly, to provide immediate relief and then to make necessary arrangements for the rehabilitation of 8½ million non-Muslims who have entered into India from the newly created Eastern and Western Pakistan..."

India 1973 available for contemporaneous reference puts the number of the refugees as nine million. So, after 5000 years of interval 500,000 people go away and it is reduced to only 8½ million....

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East): Non-Muslims?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Yes, Non-Muslims. That is what it says. If you see the same page, about a dozen sentences later, even this figure is contradicted. In the same page, another contradiction arises. There it says:

"But the refugee influx not only continued for several years reaching a

[Shri Sezhiyan]

total of about 8 million people by the end of 1950, but the gigantic task of rehabilitating these 8 million uprooted people has to be attended to."

About a dozen sentences earlier, it says 8½ million and then later on, it has come to 8 million. There it was only 'Non-Muslim' and here it is all the refugees after three years. This is a contradiction that has gone into this and unless you consider the persons who come after 5000 years to be completely devoid of any knowledge of arithmetic, you cannot explain this anomaly...

**SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI** (Bhubaneswar): The capsule will perish.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN:** It is meant to be unearthed. If it is to give the history, reflecting the conditions of the country, it should say how Parliamentary Democracy functions in this country. It simply says:

"As for the structure of the Government, the Constitution provides for a Parliamentary form of Government, as in Britain."

What is your Government? It is Government as in Britain! The explorer who comes 5,000 years later should go to the area of the globe that is Britain now and exhume another capsule if it were there to find out the nature of Parliamentary democracy in Britain to find out the type of Parliamentary democracy in India!

And also, Sir, very many wrong things have been said. It has been said:

"The Members of Lok Sabha are, with few exceptions elected directly by the people, normally once in five years."

All right, no quarrel. The next sentence says—

"The President has the power to nominate a few members to represent the backward communities or backward territories."

Nowhere in the Constitution is it said that the President should nominate a person coming from backward areas and

backward territories. The Constitution only says 'Not more than two persons to be nominated for Anglo-Indian community'. Nomination is made for one person to represent Arunachal Pradesh. The Constitution does not say, backward community or backward area. Why do you import certain things which are not there in the Constitution? The person will explore this thing 5,000 years later. What will he think? They have put the copy of the Constitution also there in the capsule. By reading both these things will he not find how inconsistent the Indian historians had been in the year 1973?

It has been said as to how the Legislative Councils in the States are being formed:

"While the Second Chamber (that is, Council) is indirectly elected by public bodies such as municipalities, universities, etc..."

If you see the Constitution, universities do not have any representation. Only the graduates have got a representation, teachers have got representation, not the universities. But the text says that universities elect Members to the Legislative Council in the States. This is not there in the Constitution.

Some new definitions have been invested. Regarding joint sector, the Capsule states:

"Private sector industries which receive financial assistance from public financial organisations like the Industrial Development Bank of India, Finance Corporation, Life Insurance Corporation and the Unit Trust are described as Joint Sectors."

If any private entrepreneur gets a loan or gets an assistance from the LIC or a public finance institution, his firm becomes a Joint Sector. That is the definition given for the Joint Sector. In cold black and white, this is written.

Also, some tall claims are being made against the dismal conditions prevailing in the Country. A true picture of India

should have been given. The authentic history boldly proclaims:

"In the field of agricultural production, the greatest achievement of free India is that the threat of famine has been virtually eliminated from the country."

They say, in the year 1973, famine has been virtually eliminated from the country. Probably, Sir, when the capsule is opened in the year 1973, famine might have been eliminated, by then, or else our people might have been eliminated, the entire world may re-enter a stone age. But they should not have tried to pass on an untruth in the capsule for future consumption.

Now, I want to give two biggest howlers which could not be found anywhere else. One of the newspapers described this as bazaar notes for the IAS. If any IAS candidate reads this thing, even if a secondary-school boy reads this thing, instead of 10,000 words, omitting the one, he would get 0000 marks for the answers he gives on the basis of distorted history.

They describe in rosy colours certain development projects undertaken in the field of Irrigation and Power. About Bhakra-Nangal Project it says:

"A joint venture of Gujarat, Haryana and Rajasthan; it is the biggest multi-purpose river valley project which has been completed."

Instead of Punjab, they have put Gujarat. The future historian should try to go to the ancient geographies of India to find that Gujarat is nowhere near Sutlej and Beas. The next one is Beas Project. It says:

"Also a joint venture of Gujarat, Haryana and Rajasthan."

It is evident that a person who does not even know the whereabouts of Gujarat or Punjab, has been commissioned to write the history to be put in the time capsule.

As I had said earlier, this text does not do justice to India. It does not do justice

even to this Government. It does not do justice to all the political parties. In regard to the Bangla Desh war, we know how much India went all the way morally and spiritually, emotionally and physically to help Bangla Desh to attain freedom. But that has been treated in a very casual and shabby way. At page 18, it has been stated:

"In the 1971 conflict India voluntarily offered cease-fire after a fourteen-day war which brought freedom to the people of Bangla Desh from the oppressive and exploitative rule of the West Pakistani military rulers."

Actually, it was the other way round. They agitated, and then we went to help them. But from this text it looks as if we went on a war and then offered cease-fire from which they got freedom. Instead of putting in only one sentence I wish they have put in a few more sentences regarding this glorious achievement of this Government of India during the 25 years of Independence.

Regarding India's physical background, what do we find in the text? What idea will a person five thousand years later get about where India was actually situated in the world geography?

In India, 1973, it has been stated:

"In the north-west, Afghanistan and Pakistan are at the border of India." But if you see this capsule text you will find only Pakistan being on the Western border. Afghanistan is obliterated out of the map in this text.

There is also another very peculiar thing. A person who comes about five thousand years later will not know how many people lived in India. Nowhere in the entire document is anything mentioned about the Indian populations about 548 million people living in India in the year 1971. A future person will never know it from this document, but he will have to make some projections and arrive at some figures in regard to the population of India.

He will also be ignorant about the languages of India. During these 25 years

[Shri Sezhiyan]

of Independence, after the British went away, the national languages have developed in a remarkable way. Very fine literature has been produced to express the aspirations and broodings of the awakening people in their own languages. But this text which devotes so many pages to so many other items has not much to offer on the linguistic pattern and growth in India of 1947—1972. Only this much about the national languages is said:

"The National Book Trust which was set up in 1957 has published so far 750 books in various Indian languages."

That is the monumental achievement in the twenty-five years of history of Independent India relating to the national languages, all the fourteen languages including Marathi, Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Malayalam, Tamil, Telegu, Kannada and other languages put together. This Government has succeeded in producing only 750 books during these twenty-five years of freedom. That is all the monumental work that they have done.

I demand that the text that has been buried with the capsule should be made public. If there is a foul murder and a hasty burial with all the evidence suppressed, the body is exhumed and sent to the experts for investigation. Here also, this capsule should be exhumed.

History has been very wildly distorted and falsified. It has become a futile exercise in inconsistency and untruth. It is not to the Opposition parties only that injustice has been done, and it is not to the Government only that injustice has been done, but they have done a great injustice to the entire Indian people, to all the 550 million people and more. This is a great injustice done by a complacent Minister and an incompetent Ministry and a person who calls himself a historian, which is a very tall and false claim to make.

17.51 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

Therefore, I once again appeal to all sections of the House and to the Minister himself not to stand on formalities, not to stand on prestige. If India's prestige is to be judged 5,000 years later, let it be examined even now. It will be a good thing to set right things which need to be set right. I am not very clear about the Minister's role in this matter. He may not have looked into it. Though an eminent scholar and professor himself, he may not have looked into it; if he had, I am sure, these inaccuracies and inconsistencies would have been removed. Therefore, once again I make this appeal to the Minister.

Before I conclude, I may be permitted to lay on the Table an authenticated copy of the text duly signed by me. I am placing it on the Table. [Placed in the Library. See No. LT-5928A/73].

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will be sent to the Speaker. If he allows it, it will be done.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: In the morning, I met the Speaker and he allowed me to put an authenticated copy on the Table of the Sabha. Let Shri Sezhiyan be allowed to do so. I secured the permission of the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be examined.

सभापति महोदय : मैं हाउस के सामने एक बात रखना चाहता हूँ कि बड़े इम्पॉर्टेंट स्पीकर्स इस पर बोलने वाले हैं जैसे मिस्टर मुखर्जी हैं, बाजपेयी जी हैं, मिश्रा जी हैं, इधर से हैं ये लोग हैं और इस साइड से भी काफी नाम हैं बोलने वालों के और हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि किसी को यह फीलिंग हो कि उस को अपनी आइडियाज़ को वेटिलेट करने का पूरा टाइम नहीं मिला। इसलिए अगर आप चाहें तो किसी दूसरे दिन इस को टेक अप किया जाय। आज 6 बजे तक यह चले।

**श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र :** दुबई में  
फिर रखिए ।

**सभापति महोदय :** यह तो बिजनेस  
ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी में चीज जाएगी, वहां से  
टाइम कोई फिक्स होगा तब न होगा,

I am in the hands of the House.

**PROF. S. NURUL HASAN:** I would  
like to make a submission. I have to  
go out of the country for a very impor-  
tant conference and will be away from  
Monday to Friday.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur):** It  
may be taken up the week after that.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
That will be the last week. It will  
be difficult then. (*Interruptions*)

**सभापति महोदय :** आप ठहरिये ।  
हम कोई बात कर रहे हैं एक चीज को मुलजाने  
के लिए, आप मुलजाने के बदले और उलझा  
देते हैं ।

अब बीज यह है कि हम तो टाइम फिक्स  
नहीं कर सकते हैं । दो आलटरनेटिव है ।  
एक आलटरनेटिव यह है कि अगर मेम्बर  
लोग ब्रीफ हों तो सात बजे तक इस को  
लक्ष्य कर सकते हैं । अगर नहीं तो दूसरे  
दिन जिस दिन भी डेट फिक्स होगी उस दिन  
लिया जाएगा ।

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
At what time is he leaving on Monday?

**PROF. S. NURUL HASAN:** At seven  
in the morning.

**श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र :** उस में एक बात यह  
हो कि अगर मिनिस्टर साहब नहीं रहेंगे क्योंकि  
वह बाहर जा रहे हैं तो उन की एबज में कोई  
दूसरे मिनिस्टर रहे और ट्यूजडे को बहस  
हो । हम उनकी और हाजिरी में भी बहस  
कर लेंगे ।

**सभापति महोदय :** यह हम कन्वे कर  
देंगे ।

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-  
TARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU-  
RAMAIAH):** The Business Advisory Com-  
mittee decided that it will allot two hours---  
5.0 p.m. to 7.0 p.m. That is the allotted  
time. Let us go on till 7 p.m. and then  
we will see.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I want to tell you  
that it will not be finished at 7 p.m.

**SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH:** Then  
we will postpone it to some other day  
convenient to both the parties.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** Postpone it to  
some other day. We cannot sit after  
6 p.m.

**सभापति महोदय :** तो यह सब लोगों  
की राय है कि 7 बजे तक डिबेट चले उम के  
बाद ऐडजर्न कर दिया जाय ?  
Do you agree?

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** Not after 6  
p.m.

**श्री भटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** सभापति  
जी फिर मंत्री महोदय को आ जाने दीजिए ।  
हम यह जरूर चाहते हैं कि चर्चा के समय  
मंत्री महोदय यहां रहें । अगर थोड़े दिनों  
के लिए बाहर जा रहे हैं तो जब वह लौट कर  
आ जायं, तब इस चर्चा को रख लिया जाय ।  
लकिन वह जरूर रहें । उन का रहना  
बहुत जरूरी है क्योंकि कि कटघरे में तो वह  
खड़े हैं ।

**श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र :** और प्रधान  
मंत्री को हाजिर रहना चाहिए । उन्होंने  
ही वो उस को जमींदोज किया है ।

**सभापति महोदय :** तो 6 बजे तक  
यह बहस चलेगी । उस के बाद पोस्टपोन  
हो जायेगी और फिर दूसरे किसी दिन  
इस को लिया जायगा ।

**श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र :** मगर हम  
लोगों का अनुरोध है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी रहें  
जब यह बहस चले ।

**श्री सुधाकर पांडे (चवली) :** सभापति महोदय, मैं सेक्षियन राहुब का भाषण बड़े ध्यान से सुन रहा था और मुझे ऐसा लगा कि वह तथ्य नहीं हो सकता है, वह कल्पना या उभयार्थता को चोज हो सकता है क्योंकि ऐसा मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार इतिहास नहीं लिखती होगी, लिखवाती होगी लोगों से और विद्वानों से हो लिखवाती होगी। सरकार इतिहास के सम्बन्ध में इंडियन कौंसिल ऑफ हिस्टोरिकल रिसर्च से सलाह लेती होगी और मुझे विश्वास है कि इतने बड़े कार्य के लिए भा निश्चित रूप से इस संस्था से सलाह ली गई होगी। उन लोगों के बारे में मैंने जानकारी भी प्राप्त की कि इस संस्था में कौन कौन से लोग हैं। मैं उन के नाम भी सुनाता हूँ। इस के अध्यक्ष हैं श्री आर० एस० शर्मा, अध्यक्ष, इतिहास विभाग, दिल्ली विश्व-विद्यालय, पटना वाले। प्रोफेसर बी० शेख मली, अध्यक्ष, इतिहास विभाग, मैसूर विश्व-विद्यालय, श्री सतीश चन्द्र, उपाध्यक्ष, विश्व-विद्यालय अनुदान आयोग ....

**श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र :** नाम मालूम हो गए, इनकी निष्पक्षता की भी सफाई मिल जाय।

(Interruption)

**श्री सुधाकर पांडे :** पूरे नाम पहले मैं सुन लो जिए ....

**श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र :** नाम से हम भयभीत नहीं होने वाले हैं।

**श्री सुधाकर पांडे :** हमारी तो संस्कृति है कि हम एक मक्खी को भी भयभीत नहीं करते हैं, आप तो आदमी हैं। भयभीत तो आप करते हैं।

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** इनकी संस्कृति अलग है आप की अलग है? संस्कृति तो दोनों की एक ही है।

(Interruption)

18.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven  
of the Clock on Monday, December 10,  
1973/Agrahayana 19, 1895 (Saka).