15.07 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. STEPS FOR MAINTAINING STATUS QUO OF RELIGIOUS SHRINES AND PLACES OF WORSHIP—*Contd.*

[*English*]

SHRI SUDARSAN RAYCHAUDHARY (Serampore): Sir, while I was participating in this debate on the Private Members' Resolution moved by my friend, Shri Zainal Abedin, I tried to stress one point that is, that the communalism poses the biggest danger and damage to the unity of the common people and to the unity of toiling masses, who are fighting against the poverty, hunger and destitution. This is why communalism is a weapon in the hands of power that be in our country, in our semi-feudal society. If one community of toiling people can be alienated from, can be separated from another community of toiling people in the name of religion, it would only benefit upper strata of the society who would like to see the down trodden divided. And this is why any fundamentalist party that upholds communalism or obscurantism is at the same time champions all anti-people policy economic or otherwise. This is the reason why the so called Economic reforms initiated at the overt or covert directives of the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank is considered by such parties, which is otherwise thoroughly backward in thinking and perception, as reforms as steps in the right direction. That we have already held in this House.

Sir, the reverse is also true. If any party pursues anti-people economic policies, it cannot fight whole-heartedly against communalism. It would rather compromise with and even surrender to fundamentalist parties whether of Hindu or of Muslim variety. All of us in this House should be cautious about this. This is the reason why—where there is a conscious attempt, organised struggle against feudalism, movement for land reforms we could contain communalism. That is our experience in West Bengal. Thanks to the persistant struggle of Kisam Sabhas and other mass organisations and bold initiatives that were taken by the successive Left Front Governments on land reforms we could contain communalism there.

It is indeed surprising that while it is claimed that Ram Rajya fights poverty and hunger but not a single slogan against these evils was raised during Rath Yatra, last year. Instead we have heard—we have collected from Press Reports—that inflammatory slogans were raised like Mohammadans have got only two places to go *Kabristan or* let them go to Pakistan. Only when the elections came nearer, questions of *Roti* and *Insaf* were invoked, just to give Ram a human face. Under the circumstances, I firmly believe that the fight against communalism is closely inter-woven with a fight against communalism. You cannot fight in one front and at the same time capitulate in the other front. But apart from taking such stand, certain legal, formal and constitutional steps should immediately be taken in view of the fact that the Vishwa Hindu Parishad had already said that they are going to construct Ram temple in coming November, at the disputed site.

The BJP's open support to Vishwa Hindu Parishad's move is dangerous. I will not go into the past that the Babri Masjid was very much alive and functional till the night of 22 or 23 December, 1949, when the idol of Ram miraculously appeared at the site of the Mosque. Every one knows the real facts regarding such miracles. I just want to stress that Ram Janmabhoomi dispute is to be solved within the framework of our Constitution, in a peaceful way. To say that this particular issue is out of bounds of Court of law is dangerous, for the very concept of secularism for the very concept of judicial independence

[Sh. Sudarsan Raychaudhary]

which are part and parcel of any thought of liberal democracy.

Secondly who authorised the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and the BJP to represent the entire Hindu community? The way they are confining Ram in a particular piece of land... (*Interruptions*)

Why are you shouting? Is this the way to behave? (*Interruptions*). The way they are confining Ram in a particular piece of land, I am sure would not be liked by any sensible Hindu.

May I quote Poet Rabindranath Tagore?

He wrote: "The truth is what you yourself construct Ram was not born in the forest of Ayodhya. He was born in our mind the poet's mind."

I have heard that BJP also likes it. (*Interruptions*) You challenge Rabindranath Tagore. Why challenge me? I am just quoting Tagore. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not the way to behave. Let him speak.

SHRI SUDARSAN RAYCHAUDHARY: BJP considers Rabindranath Tagore was a great poet. There is nothing knew in it. All of us so consider. But the BJP considers Rabindranath Tagore as a great Hindu poet. So, I would request the BJP to follow the concept of their great Hindu poet at least and shun the path of inciting violence and inciting communal passion to gain political mileage and having narow political gains.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Although you may have opposite views, you must listen.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: We have limited time. We had already two sessions for discussing this Resolution. Today is the third session. I do not know how long it will take. I think the House should decide how much time we are going to allot to this Resolution. There should be a time limit for this Resolution. (*Interruptions*) Otherwise, you know what happened the other day in the House. I would suggest that half of the time should be given to those who are in favour of this Resolution and half of the time should be given to those who are against the Resolution. This is not the Govenment's Resolution; this is the Private Member's Resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. This is your suggestion.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): There should be a time limit for every speaker. Some speaker takes one hour while other speakers do not get time. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will give only 10-15 minutes to every speaker.

[*Translation*]

MAHANT ABEDYA NATH (Gorakhpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for offering me an opportunity to present my views on this resolution. Sir. the resolution presented by the hon. Member contains two parts. The first part reveals that the Ram Janmabhoomi Babri Masjid issue may be resolved through negotiation and goodwill.

Sir, as far as this part of the resolution is concerned we have ne-

ver spoken against resolving this issue through negotiation. During the tenure fo the former Prime Ministers Late Shri Rajiv Gandhi, Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh and Shri Chandra Shekhar, concerted efforts to tackle this issue through negotiations were made. Sir, Shri Chandra Shekhar, while initiating an excellent measure to find a solution to this issue, had asked for evidence from both sides.

On the basis of the literary, historical and archaeological evidence, produced by us and keeping in view the actual state of things, it can be categorically stated that Babri Masjid was built after demolishing Ram Mandir. Similarly, scores of muslim brethren have announced that they would accept and give this site to the Hindus if it is proved by them that Babri Masjid was constructed after demolishing Ram Mandir.

Sir, all the evidence relating to this issue have been produced. Now it is to consider that if Lord Ram was not born there, how could there be a place of worship of another religion at the entrance of the mosque. If you personally visit Ayodhya, you will find that the site in front of so called Babri Masjid is worshiped as Ram Janmabhoomi and this fact has been accepted even by the entire Muslim community. That place has been recognised as the birth place of Lord Rama and if it is in the premises of the mosque, it is certain that Lord Ram was born there before Babar and that place definitely existed before Babar.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, moreover, it is necessary to consider that magnificient temples of Lord Ram at the cost of crores of rupees are built in the entire Ayodhya. Therefore, keeping in view the religious and historical facts, that is the only place where Lord Ram took birth. Only a raised platform of 4′ × 4′ exists in the name of Lord Rama whereas this site has been recognised as the most sacred place from both historical and religious points of view. Sir, we should think that no caste would struggle for an insignificant thing or cause for thousands of years, burn themselves like a moth and sacrifice their lives.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is a hundred of years old dispute, not of today. There are evidences about it. Leave aside the British and Hindu historians, the Muslims historians themselves have accepted the fact that Babri Masjid was built by Babar by demolihsing the Ram Janmabhoomi temple. Aurangazeb's grand daughter had accepted this fact and the father of eminent scholar of Muslim community Ali Mian, who is at present a resident of Lucknow, acknowledged this fact in his book also

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: He has never said such a thing. (*Interruptions*)

MAHANT ABEDYA NATH: We will produce evidence in this regard. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not proper. Please sit down. It is not proper that as soon as a Member speaks something which you do not like, you go on interrupting. It is not proper, please.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MAHANT ABEDYA NATH. They know that they have no reply to our arguments and hence they are not allowing us to speak. Sir, if Goa could be retrieved after 400 years.....

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Sir, we are all Members. We are neither representing Babri Masjid Action Committee nor Vishwa Hindu Parishad...(*Interruptions*) Are you representing Vishwa Hindu Parishad? .....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. L. SHARMA PREM (East-Delhi): We are representing Ram Janam Bhoomi... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: There is an attempt to communalise the whole debate here. Please do not do that. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MAHANT ABEDYA NATH: If the lost independence could be gained after a thousand years, why can't we get our sacred place of worship back which had been demolished and mosque built there during those 400 years of slavery when we were helpless, weak and dependent... (*Interruptions*)... Sir, it is said and you are also well aware about the fact that many of our temples have become a part of Pakistan after partition and in India also injustice is being done with Hindus. The signs of temples are retained on the mosque to humilitate Hindus. Similarly, I would like to express my views on the second part of this resolution. This part speaks of preserving and maintaining the *status quo* of all religious shrines and places of worship as on August 15, 1947. Sir, due to policy of appeasement male members of a particular community are allowed four marriages. Article 370 in the constitution is only to appease minorities. Similarly, today also, this resolution for preserving and maintaining *status quo* of all religious shrines and places of worship as they existed on August 15, 1947, is being brought to appease that particular community. I want to say that if you are in favour of maintaining the *status quo* of all religious shrines and places of worship, first of all bring about the unification of India and Pakistan. If you wish to maintain *status quo*, you have the right to make such a claim only when you restore the temples which are now in Pakistan or Bangladesh. If this resolution is passed, Hindus will not accept it and they will revolt...(*Interruptions*) As such, the movers of this resolution do not want peace in the country. Will the Somnath temple be handed over to Muslims? Will the idols worshipped in Ayodhya since 1949 be removed from here after the bill is passed? Do you think that such a move would restore peace in the country? The passing of such a bill can never bring peace. Peace can be restored only when a law is enacted to this effect that those temples which were demolished and mosques built on those sites be given back to the Hindus. Otherwise, you are aware that after the formation of Pakistan many mosques were demolished in Haryana and Punjab and Gurdwaras were built on those sites. Have you courage to demolish those Gurdwaras and reconstruct mosques there? Such things are not in the interest of the country and you cannot establish unity between Hindus and Muslims in this way. If the Muslims brethern are in favour of establishing Hindu Muslims unity in right earnest, for them the need of the hour is to accept reality and on the basis of historical, circumstantial and archaeological evidence, they should accept our demand for Ram Janmabhoomi. In ancient times thousands of temples were demolished but we are not making any demand for them. Our demand is solely confined to those temples whose remains are still intact on the sites of mosques. (*Interruptions*). In Varanashi the remains of Vishwanath temples, which was demolished and a mosque constructed on that site, remind the Hindus of their plight in this independent India. Even today the signs of slavery exist on the temple of Lord Rama who is worshipped by crores

of Hindus. The plight of Hindus living in this country is similar to that head of a family who is tied to a free members of his family are being raped in his presence but he is helpless. The Hindu community will continue their struggle to fight against this embarrassment. You say that I am a member of Vishwa Hindu Parishad but all the elected representatives have full right to express their views here. No Member can check the same. (*Interruptions*) As such, I would like to say that no such Bill should be moved in this august House in the name of secularism which is a blow on the sentiments of eighty per cent Hindus living in this country. There is a move to divide and humiliate the Hindus for creating vote bank. They are being divided on the basis of castes and in consequence it is causing ham to the unity between Hindus and Muslims.

With these words, I would request you not to compel the Government to move such a bill.....

(Interruptions)

[*English*]

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): After seeing what is happening in the House. I want to revive the old proposal that the proceedings of Lok Sabha should be telecast so that the people of this country should have the opportunity to know how we are behaving in this House (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI (Deogarh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wonder whether this is, in fact, a Chamber of Parliament of India. All that has happened and that is happening in the course of this Debate gives rise to a doubt whether this is one Chamber of our sacred Parliament of India or outside the Parliament a gathering, of a particular region or community. So, I am really sorry. As you said, this is definitely a controversial subject and in a subject of controversy, controversial views, diametrical opposite views will, of course, be there. But, what is the harm in expressing those views on this subject also in a very cordial atmosphere. Such controversy or scene does not give a good impression of our conduct as hon. Members of sacred Parliament.

As I said that this is a controversial issue. But, I think the Resolution, as suggested by the hon. Member Shri Zamal Abedin, is non-controversial. The Resolution, the wording, the suggestion given, is not controversial. According to me there can be no controversy ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gandhi Nagar): Sir, I entirely agree with hon. Member, Shri Panigrahiji, that this is a matter, which even though it is a controversial, it should be possible for the House to discuss the issues and it pros and cons. Every one knows that our attitude and the attitude of some other Members of the House is different on this particular issue. I would point out

15.36 hrs. [RAO RAM SINGH *in the Chair*]

also that till now two Members have spoken from my party. Shri Shreesh Chandra Dikshit and Mahant Abedya Nath. Both of them have tried to present the point of view of our party in a logical, rationale manner with which someone may agree, some one may not agree and it was the interruptions that created a different kind of climate. Then once Shri Dikshit and Mahant Abedya Nath were interrupted in this manner, the tendency is to respond in the same coin. I do not approve of it. I do not think that totally a different point of view can be expressed—Shri Abedin or any other Member can

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]

express. But, unless we are willing to hear each other, this is bound to happen. And, therefore, I would plead with the whole House that hereafter let this debate continue in a proper manner, points of views be expressed and then whatever be the decision of the House will have to be accepted...(*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I entire agree with what Shri Advaniji has said. I think we are all mature people. We should discuss this very very important national issue in a very logical and mature manner. There is no room for showing emotions and also, I must say, that there is no room for shouting slogans in the House.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: May I submit something, Sir? I am entirely in agreement that this is House. In fact, there were solgans in this House when the oath-taking was taking place, and at that point of time I had pointed out to my colleagues that when the House meets for the Joint Session, let us maintain complete decorum and no chanting of slogans of any kind should be there. And there was perfect order. But here in this House, when from the other side provocative remarks are made, interruptions are made and an affront is made...(*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Please do not interrupt. I will give chance to evey hon. Member to put forth his views in a calm and collected manner. But I would request you that everybody has got a right to speak, and when a senior Member like Mr. Advani is speaking, I would kindly request you not to interrupt.....

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you do not agree with his views. I promis you I shall give you adequate time to reply and to say whatever views you have got to put forward. Now, Mr. Advani was on his legs and I would request not to interrupt till he has finished.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have nothing more to add except that if for what I am saying at the moment, I am sought to be shouted down by those benches, then the reaction from this side is bound to be there. Therefore, this attempt at shouting down Dikshitji, shouting down at Mahant Abedya Nathji is the root cause of the disturbance that has taken place during these three sessions. Otherwise this would not have happened. .....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh): Mr. Chairman, we have great regards for our colleague Shri Advaniji and respectfully we listened to him. But this is not fair, because he is a senior Member, to just charge us that it is because other Members were interrupting. When Mr. Zainal Abedin was moving this Resolution, you must have noticed that time and again he was interrupted, and when our friend from the other side was just speaking, the same thing happened. I totally agree with you that there should be full freedom of expression. We must maintain the dignity and decorum of the House. We should allow the Members to speak, unless and until there is anything where you feel that with your permission somebody wants to say something. I think this is a very sensitive issue. We all agree to this. Therefore, I will request you Advaniji to please ask your Members also not to shout. It is not that our side is doing and they are not doing it. Nobody should interrupt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: O.K., thank you. I think there is no harm in a little bit of friendly bent of that kind. But I would request everybody to keep his or her emotions

within check. Although I do not like to say, because Mr. Advani is a very senior Member, but because there was a precedence of slogan shouting at one time or the other that does not give any licence for slogan shouting to be continued. So, I would, with folded hands, request all sections of the House that please let us not indulge in any slogan shouting in the House

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI: Thank you, Sir. I think with this, good sense will prevail and we will have a very cordial atmosphere in this House over this debate.

Sir, this is no doubt a sensitive issue and this has sparked off controversy in the form of communal riots claiming 564 lives in police firing. Communal riots had sparked off because of this Babri Masjid-Ram Janam Bhoomi controversy and the resultant police firing killed an estimated 564 people within a brief period from 1st September to 20th November, 1990. There were as many as forty major riots all over the country. The consequence of this was so serious.

It is all a meaningless controversy. Why should there be such a controversy over this sensitive issue? It is better if all of us, atleast political parties, develop proper attitude and proper approach to this because as you know, all political parties are committed to communal harmony, communal amity and they are also committed to promote secularism. Of course, in this respect some of us are doing something else. But we take oath under the Constitution and in our very Preamble to the Constitution we have this provision of secularism and we are committed to it. When this controversy is there and communal riots do take place, it also has its repercussions outside India. We find reaction in other countries also. When we are engaging ourselves in this, I would say that it is a petty, narrow issue and we are indulging in it as if there are no national problems. In fact, we have our very solidarity, integrity and national unity being threatened and if this sort of controversy is allowed to develop, that would further aggravate the situation. Our attempt to divide the country along caste lines and along communal lines would further aggravate and endanger our national unity and national solidarity. Therefore, Sir, it has to be resolved, through mutual discussion as early as possible.

I am not going to the origin of this controversy, it has been dealt at length by some previous speakers. Of course, I wonder because in history, I may be ignorant about it but what we read is that Babar advised his son to respect all religious sentiments and religious places of all communities irrespective of their religion. This is what we used to read when we were students in High School or even earlier. How can such a person be blamed today for the demolition of a mandir, I wonder. If our friends on the other side have a convincing proof, well, I think there is some forum and I think that forum is still open for the evidence to be adduced or for placing the documents etc. They claim to possess records about all these things, but we have read in our student days that Babar was a liberal administrator, a liberal king, and so he advised his son to behave this way. (*Interruptions*). Of course, you can come with your proof or evidence etc. whatever you have.

So, it has to be resolved and as you know, the secularism that I was referring to is the cornerstone of our nationhood. Secularism in our country, as you know, is the pivot of our ancient culture and its unity in diversity. It is our responsibility to strengthen the national unity and integrity irrespective of different castes, religions and ethnic minorities.

[Sh. Sriballav Panigrahi]

We are following the path of our great Congress leaders for strengthening the unity of the country. Several great leaders of Congress have sacrificed their lives for putting off the fire of communalism. It is very easy to whip up communalism, to arouse communal passions, but we should remain far away from that. In our country it is very difficult to do so. Ours is a country where Buddha, Asoka, Gandhi and Jawaharlal were born and they were the torch bearers of peace and non-violence not only in India, but in the world at large and in such a country, now violence is overtaking us threatening our unity and integrity. So, now we should calmly address ourselves to this problem and there is no problem without a solution. No problem is there which is beyond a solution. There is a solution; there could be a peaceful solution. Therefore, as Shri Zainal Abedin has suggested, this problem can be settled through mutual discussions. I was told that such discussions were fruitless and futile exercises were going on for a long time. If it was left half way, I think, we can again start it. If there is no solution through mutual discussions, then naturally we have to depend upon the court of law. We have the rule of law and it is not a lawless jungle. So, we have to abide by the Court decision.

Sir, Shri Dixit went on harping that right from the beginning they are abiding by the decision of the Court and they had never ignored the Court decision. We welcome this stand. If our friends are abiding by the Court decision right from the beginning, why can they not abide the last decision also? The matter is now pending in the Allahabad High Court. So, they should abide by the final verdict of the Court.

Then, Sir, I would really appreciate the stand taken by the BJP Member Shri Arvind Trivedi. In today's *Times of India*, he has given an interview. In that interview, he says there are so many burning problems which need our immediate attention like problems of price rise, unemployment etc. He is a very good actor who had acted in the TV Serial *Ramayan* as *Ravana* and he is now elected on the BJP ticket. He said that this temple construction can wait. Further he has stated that this problem can be settled through peaceful negotiations. So, what Shri Arvind Trivedi has said is in the same spirit of the resolution. The Opposition Leader Shri Advani, while speaking earlier, said that they have got a mandate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not the subject of the resolution. You kindly speak on the subject matter of the resolution.

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI: Sir, in this land, we are committed to promote secularism and without secularism we cannot move an inch forward in strengthening our national unity and integrity, which is the need of the hour. In a country of India's dimension, these kind of problems can be settled through peaceful negotiations. If negotiations fail, then we have to go by the Court decision. We have achieved our independence 44 years ago on 15th August, 1947. Now, we want to pass a law for maintaining the status quo of all places of worship, as they were on the famous day when we achieved our independence. What is wrong about it? We have our own problems. The world is changing. The society is changing. We have to keep running to keep in tune with the changing circumstances of the world. Otherwise, we will be left behind. There is a question of hunger; there is a question of backwardness. We have to fight regionalism which is also showing its ugly head. No religion is bad. It is not bad also to be religious. Secularism does not say that it is non-religious, but equal respect for all religions. It is bad to be communal. But it is

not bad to be religious. It is good to be religious. All religions basically stand for better human being, better life and humaneness. There is a serious conflict going on in everybody's mind and heart between the evil forces and good forces. It is the religion which helps the good forces to defeat the evil forces in this conflict. Those who want to create mischief with political motives, those who want to make some selfish gains try to interpret religion in a different way to suit their design and convenience. Therefore, what is needed in the present context is, we should separate religion from politics. It is being done in other countries also.

Let us be religious but let us not bring in religion into politics and pollute the Indian national atmosphere or nationhood.

With these words, I make an appeal to all concerned that let us rise above all these small things and try to be Indian first, Indian second and Indian last and also try to strengthen our unity, integrity and build up a strong united India.

[*Translation*]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV (Jhanjharpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I support the Motion moved by Shri Zainal Abedin Sahib. This is a Private Members' Resolution and is of national importance. It is linked with the question of security of the nation and safeguarding the principles of secularism. Sir, it is my humble submission that we should discuss this matter rising above party politics.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I believe that the way the facts are presented, arguments and counter arguments are made, it does not lead us to truth. So we should discuss this important problem in a peaceful manner. This is a national and a burning problem. Communalism is the biggest challenge to the country these days. Sir, according to the Report of the Home Ministry, 831 people have lost their lives so far in the communal riots which were a result of Ayodhya Problem.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is the biggest problem which the country is facing today and the people who create friction on the basis of trifling religious issues are mainly responsible for these tensions. Because of these communal clashes children, women and innocent people are killed. My submission is that this House should consider this problem very deeply.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, communalism starts in the name of religion, When the people of one community identify themselves as different from other communities, then communalism takes root.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, when religion is operated by those people who have blind faith, it gives rise to communalism. When religion is associated with external ostentations and wrong standards the result is communal psyche. It is also the result of loss of human values and confinement of religion to stones, temples, mosques and customs. Whenever fundamentalism was rampant in this country, there were atrocities on communal lines and the society and nation became weak. Now-a-days the fundamentalist forces want to make political capital out of religion therefore they keep the countrymen away from the basic realities of religion and take them nearer to the systems of worship, idols, temples and mosques so that the people remain far away from the real problems of the nation, and help bring the person to power as a saviour of their faith. Now, nobody can deny this fact that politics is behind increasing communal tensions. But it will not serve any purpose by merely holding the communalists responsible for converting politics into communalism. We people,

[Sh. Devendra Prasad Yadav]

who are in favour of bringing changes in the politics of the country cannot shirk our responsibility because we have not been able to effectively combat this ideology which is knowingly or unknowingly allowed to function.

Some Hon. Members have just hinted towards it. When we were studying in the college, we were taught "Good conductor and bad conductor" in Physics. Now-a-days some political people in this country neglect the bad conductor and catch hold of good conductor in order to flare up communal frenzy and create communal tension in the country. If an iron rod is heated at one end, the other end also gets heated up. Likewise if riots and communal feelings flare up at one end it spreads to the other end also, i.e. it spreads to other parts also. Today, the people belonging to Vishwa Hindu Parishad are giving the slogan of "Jai Shri Rama", I want to tell them that this country does not belong to "Jai Shri Rama" alone. Poor people, downtrodden and exploited people are also a part of this country. Today, agitations to counter the problems of price-rise, unemployment and corruption are not given due importance. Now-a-days, if there is a struggle against price-rise and corruption in one part of the country it does not spread to another part but if the communal harmony between Hindus and Muslims is disturbed in one part it moves throughout the country. Some people give it a political colour and exploit it fully to gain political foothold and power, but nobody can tolerate it. India is a vast country. It is the land of Gandhi and Mahatma Buddha. Communalism will be crushed here. Some clever leaders are giving loud statements here. I wanted to speak on this topic at the time of budget and even now I will speak on this subject although it is a Private Member's Resolution...(*Interruptions*)...

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Please speak on the subject alone.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Please listen to the subject....(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Chairman, Sir, Babri Masjid was constructed in 1528. What is the reason that till now there was no harm to Hinduism in spite of the presence of Babri Masjid? How did it change, all at once. Why after 40-42 years of independence Hinduism cannot exist if Rama Mandir is not constructed at the site of Babri Masjid? What kind of Hinduism is this? Who will decide it after 40 years of independence...?...(*Interruptions*) Today Vishwa Hindu Parishad makes an announcement that they will construct a temple there after demolishing the mosque...(*Interruptions*)... That is why I want to say that now-a-days common men, Hindus and Muslims, want to live as brothers but deliberate attempts are made to divide them. The interests of minorities are undermined and their religious feelings are hurt. I was mentioning this because in this country...

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my religious feelings are hurt when the honourable Member speaks these words. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: As far as hurting of religious feelings is concerned, the Rama Rath Yatra started in the name of Rama Mandir, was it for the good of 52 per cent backward people. It was a method adopted for blocking 27 per cent reservation for the backwards, ...(*Interruptions*)...We did not intend to say all this, but when you provoke us, we have to say these things. I want to say because...(*Interruptions*) ...as far as the question of taking of the Rama Ratha Yatra to Ayodhya is concerned, it was...(*Interruptions*) ...taken out not for the safety of Hinduism but to uphold the caste system only...

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is on a point of order.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Sir, a few minutes ago Shri Advani advised this House that there should not be any interruptions when a Member is speaking. Let it be maintained.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly sit down. That hon. Member has raised a point of order. He will be given full opportunity to raise his point of order.

[Translation]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (Ajmer): Sir, the person who occupying the chair before you had said that every person will speak for not more than 10 minutes. He has exceeded ten minutes. He did not allow honourable mahant Abedya Nathji. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. I have listened to your point of order. I feel the subject which is being debated at the moment is a very important subject, therefore, the time may be increased from 10 minutes to 20 minutes. That would be better. You allow him to speak. Now, your point of order is over. Take your seat, please.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there is duality of approach in this country. There are some shrewd leaders in this country, they get wide publicity, and they are attractive also, that is why I want to mention all these things. When fight for social justice was going on in this country they issued a crafty statement that the implementation of the recommendations of Mandal Commission would be decided by court and the issue of Ram Temple would be decided taking into the sentiments of the people.

I would like to mention this thing because 52 per cent people are backward, 85 per cent are poor, depressed and exploited. If there is any question of the welfare of such people, it will be referred to High Court where it will remain undecided for long. Then there will be the decision of the court. Regarding Ram Mandir, neither court order nor the constitution nor the feelings would be accepted. Who will decide the case? As far as the general consensus and feelings are concerned, it should be discussed as to whose sentiments would be respected...(Interruptions)...I have mentioned this because I think that riots have not taken place in states where the administration acted in a non-partisan manner to maintain communal harmony. I would like to cite the example of Bihar in this regard. It has been proved beyond doubt in Bihar, particularly during the elections. Some political parties wanted to flare up communal frenzy in the name of construction of Ram temple but the people knew their game and remained united. That was the main reason why there were riots in other parts of the country whereas Bihar remained peaceful. There were no riots in the State. The Chief Minister of Bihar deserves to be congratulated for this. The 'Ram Rath' which flared up communal tension in the name of construction of Ram Temple ...(Interruptions)

SHRI VINAY KATIYAR (Faizabad): The hon. Member should speak on the related subject. He is side tracking the issue and just delivering a long speech. He does not know the facts about the controversy. He should speak the facts relating to the topic under discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not a point of order.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Chairman, Sir, some parties have launched a campaign for the construction of Ram temple. I would like to point out categorically that the poor in our country...(*Interruptions*)...recite the name of Rama, but they adore the *Maryada Purushottam* Lord Rama and not the fake Rama...(*Interruptions*)...Mr. Chairman, Sir, the poor in the villages have a firm belief that Lord Rama will emancipate them from misery...(*Interruptions*)...Even when they fall sick they recite the name of Rama but these people are misusing the name of Rama...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAM NAGINA MISHRA (Padrauna): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Constitution stipulates that the religious sentiments of no community should be hurt. Lord Rama is worshipped throughout the country and he is considered to be God. Fortunately the hon. Member is a Hindu but even then he has used words like fake Rama...(*Interruptions*)... This should be expunged from the proceedings of the House...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. The point of order raised by the hon. Member regarding fake Rama is not valid. He will not make such remarks about Lord Rama who is referred as god...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member never intended to hurt the religious sentiments of anybody. Now for that matter my name is Ram Singh. I can be a fake Rama. But this does not mean that Lord Rama is fake...(*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: The word 'fake Rama' should be expunged from the proceedings...(*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAM NAGINA MISHRA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I accept your ruling. Whom did he want to refer when he said fake Rama. We were discussing *Maryada Purushottam* Lord Rama here...(*Interruptions*)...It should be expunged from the proceedings. It is not an ordinary thing. Syed Shahabuddin is sitting here. Had anybody referred to Allah in this way...(*Interruptions*). Lord Rama cannot be put to disgrace like this... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI B. L. SHARMA PREM (East-Delhi): We cannot afford to listen the word 'fake Rama'...(*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, he should withdraw the word 'fake'. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there is anything which hurts the religious sentiments of somebody in that part of the proceedings, I would request the hon. Speaker to expunge it.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: I did not pass any remarks about *Maryada Purushottam* Lord Rama. I always speak with a sense of responsibility. I was referring to those who recite the name of Rama like

"*Ek kilo Mein Nau So Gram, Jai Sri Rama Tolo Kam, Bolo Bam*"

Not I alone but the entire country worships *Maryada Purushottam* Lord Rama. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yadavji please close this chapter now.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is not justified that the hon. Members of one side are allowed to speak for two hours whereas the Members of the other side get very little time. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now please conclude. Members from both sides have enjoyed your speech.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: I do not believe in having two faces under one hood. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am speaking on the subject under discussion and not side tracking. (*Interruptions*) Sir, I was submitting my view point but there were lot of interruptions in between.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would request the hon. Members to allow two more minutes to him to wind up and let the proceedings continue. If you do not allow him to speak the time of the House will be wasted.

[*English*]

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): These Members cannot dictate terms to the Chair. This is very unfair. The hon. Member who is on his legs must be allowed to make his points. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No interruptions please. Shri Devendra Prasad, please address the Chair and don't indulge in cross talks.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was making my point but I was interrupted repeatedly. I need your protection. Mr. Chairman, Sir, *Maryada Purushottam* Lord Rama invaded Lanka to kill demon Ravana who symbolised injustice. But we never heard invasion of Ayodhya in the name of Rama. Ayodhya is witness to it in recent times. The people of Vishwa Hindu Parishad..... (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was submitting that if decision of the Court in the matter is not accepted by these people, the religious sentiments of minorities and those who believe in secular principles would be hurt. Now they are saying that the construction work of the temple would commence at the disputed site in November, 'Mandir Waheen Banayenge' (the temple would be built there itself), they say. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this issue is not restricted to Ayodhya only, it involves 3,000 disputed shrines. If a temple is constructed at any of these disputed sites, the country will be divided. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, today the country is on the brink of disintegration. 1946-47 witnessed the worst communal riots, the country was partitioned. That great humanitarian, Mahatma Gandhi, the greatest advocate of secularism stood for equality for one and all, Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims, Christians etc. in the country (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, which force of our country snatched away Mahatma Gandhi from our midst at that time? Those very forces are today once again raising their heads in the name of the construction of the temple. (*Interruptions*) They snatched away our beloved Babu Gandhiji who sacrificed his life for the cause of human values. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I request you, not to interrupt him. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Do not interrupt him.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly sit down. Now, I called Shri Mohan Rawle to speak.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: If he is not allowed to complete, we will also not allow anybody to speak from this side. Is this the way to interrupt a Member? (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already called Shri Mohan Rawle to speak.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seats. What Shri Mohan Vishnu Rawle say will only go on record.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing is going on record, please sit down.

(*Interruptions*)*

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing is being recorded. Kindly sit down.

(*Interruptions*)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing is being recorded. Please take your seats.

(*Interruptions*)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: When I am on my feet, you should sit down.

(*Interruptions*)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will be recorded unless you sit down.

*Not recorded.

Now, there is a point of order. Shri Kapse.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM KAPSE (Thane): My point of order is this. The present speaker spoke in so many words about who murdered Mahatma Gandhi and other things. Mahatma Gandhi murder case was decided long back and it was decided that only Godse was responsible for that and no other force was working with him. A charge was made during his speech and there was nothing to prove his charge. So, I request you to kindly look into the matter and that his words should be expunged.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will look into the matter and the Speaker will also look into the matter.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav, please take your seat. You are crossing the limits.

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Yadav, I have given you sufficient chance. Now, Shri Mohan Rawle.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI MOHAN VISHNU RAWLE (Bombay South Central): Mr. Chairman, Sir, some hon. Members of the House have demanded that evidence in support of Rama Janambhoomi be produced before the House. The hon. Member, who has just now concluded his speech said that the Babri Masjid was constructed in 1528. We have evidence with us of that period too, to prove our claim. If the Babri Masjid was constructed in 1528 A.D., then let me add here that the struggle for the

restoration of the Rama Janambhoomi temple has been going on since then, and it will continue till the goal is achieved. Lord Rama is India's ideal. People, both at home and abroad were reminded and made aware of *Maryada Purushottam* Rama's ideals, through the popular television serial 'Ramayana'. Mahatma Gandhi dreamt of establishing a 'Rama Rajya' in India, we too are committed towards that goal. But in order to establish 'Rama Rajya'. it is imperative to re-construct Rama temple at the original site. Now I will place before you the evidences, we have in this regard.....(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK (Buldana): Sir, during the election campaign, they had been saying that if they come to power, they would remove Mahatma Gandhi's statue and in its place would install Nathuram Godse's statue. What are they talking about Mahatma Gandhi's *Ramrajya*? (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI MOHAN VISHNU RAWLE: Let me quote from page No. 22:

[*English*]

"In 1528 AD, Babar came to Ayodhya (Aud) and halted for a week. He destroyed the ancient temple (marking the birth place of Rama) and on its site built a mosque, still known as Babar's mosque..... It has two inscriptions one on the outside, one on the pulpit; both are in Persian and bear the date 935 AH. This date may be that of the completion of the building."

[*Translation*]

The so called Babri Masjid is in fact the original site of the Rama Temple. Every mosque has within its precincts, a tank, which the worshippers use for washing their hands before offering prayers. This is the case with mosques all over the world, but in the Mosque at Ayodhya, it's not there. Moreover, the idols of Gods and Goddesses are there on the walls of the so-called 'Mosque'. There is not a single Mosque in the world where prayers are offered to anyone other than Allah, but in this particular structure, people pay obeisance to Lord Rama. Not only this, this mosque has no minarets and there is no evidence to prove that 'Namaz' was offered here. Wonder of wonders, the sanctum sanctorum (Garbha Griha) has a 'Parikrama' around it. Further, had it been a Mosque, the western side wall should have been plain. The temple of Lord Rama was closed for worship and locked in 1949, but later on, the temple was thrown open to the public for the purpose of worship under the orders of the court of law. Mahmood Ghazni was responsible for the destruction of the Somnath temple. Our First President Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Sardar Vallabbhai Patel, on whom "Bharat Ratna' has been conferred, took active part in the re-construction of the Somnath shrine. The rejuvenation and the re-construction of that temple took place with the express consent of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, one of the stalwarts of the Party, which is occupying the treasury benches today. We had hoped that in continuance of that legacy, they would allow us to construct the Rama temple also, unfortunately, they did not. Then we moved the Court. Prayers are being offered there since 1949 to date and the Priest performs the 'Archana' under police protection. In 1986, the temple gates

[Sh. Mohan Vishnu Rawle]

were formally unlocked. It is most unfortunate that we are being dubbed as communalists. When the temple was thrown open to the public for worship in 1986, under the orders of the court of law, riots took place and atrocities were committed on us. Not only this, riots took place in Pakistan too and Hindu shrines were descrated and destroyed. What do speak of Pakistan, in independent India itself, more than 40 temples were badly damaged and destroyed in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Today, these very people are accusing us of being communalists. I would like to know from them, whether there is a single mosque in the country, which has even slightly been damaged. The answer is a flat no. We regard Lord Rama as our idol, he never did injustice to anyone, we too are not doing that. We are not for constructing a temple over some mosque. We are just demanding the site which originally belongs to us.

Today, those very people, who speak of 'Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam' (that the whole Universe is one family) are opposing the construction of this temple in the name of religion and they are fanning communalism in the country. When we say that Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians are all brothers, I wonder why we don't have a uniform law for everyone? It is most unfortunate. These people are cowards just now. one of the hon. Members said that this problem should be settled according to constitutional provisions, then certainly we should have a uniform civil code too, as per the constitution, but they are not prepared for that because they don't want to lose their vote bank and they want the people to remain divided on communal lines. The national song 'Vande Matram' is sung throughout the country. Literally speaking, the song is an obeisance to Mother India, but unfortunately one of the important leaders of the ruling party declared during the election compaign for the Bombay Municipality, that Members of his community won't sing that song. They are opposing that very slogam of 'Vande Mataram', which inspired a number of our Muslim breathren to lay down their life for the country. They are opposing it in the name of religion. It was this very slogan that inspired millions of our countrymen to sacrifice their precious life for the country. It is our national song and we should have respect for it. Religion should in no way come in its way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not the subject matter of the Resolution.

SHRI MOHAN VISHNU RAWLE: I am saying all this because they are accusing us of being communalists. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Please do not use this august House for anti-religious propaganda.

SHRI MOHAN VISHNU RAWLE: 'Vande Mataram', written by Bankim Chandra Chatterjee is the glory of our nation. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Sir, he does not know who penned the poem. Forgive his ignorance, but expunge those remarks..... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI MOHAN VISHNU RAWLE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, those people who divided the country on religious lines and who were responsible for the creation of Pakistan are today preventing the community from joining the national mainstream in the name of religion. It is my humble submission that India can remain as one entity, only if the temple of Lord Rama, our national idol, is reconstructed. It

is our demand that the Government should allow the construction of the temple, at its original site itself. I request you do agree to it. I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

SMT. VIJAYARAJE SCINDIA (Guna): Sir, I feel that the manner in which this important issue was being debated a short while ago in this august House, was creating nothing else but bitterness and this kind of bitterness would certainly hurt those who are sincerely interested in the unity of the country. I think what I am going to say will not be liked by either of the sides. I would like to present a bitter truth before you. Instead of dragging this issue, which is before us, it is important for us to peep into ourselves and find out whether we are really interested in unity, integrity, peace, brotherhood and goodwill of the country? If we are, I feel that this is not the way to achieve it. This is an important issue. What request should I make? It is fair neither for this side nor that to drag the name of Lord Ram into any dispute because I think, Ram is a national figure. He is my God or almighty and is considered so by lakhs and crores of people but in this august House we are taking this issue as a national issue.

Sir, every community, society and nation has its own honour, glory and culture and no one can break relationship with one's culture which one has inherited. Our ancient culture does not belong to any particular religion, Hinduism, Islam or Christianity but it belongs to every person living in this country and Lord Ram is a symbol of 'Maryada Purushottam' to us. Will any one, whether he is a Muslim or a Christian or follower of some other religion, say that he does not recognize him as 'Maryada Purshottam'? Can any one refuse to accept him as a national figure? Were Ram and Krishna not our ancestors? Was Babar our ancestor? I would like to say that this issue is not of a temple or a mosque, which are built of bricks, stones, lime and cement but it is a national issue and if we are keen to achieve national unity and are in favour of restoring peace, goodwill and cordial relations with each other, all of us should look at this issue from national point of view.

No caste or nation can survive with self respect by separating itself from its culture or glory. I would like to say whether we are Hindus, Muslims, Christians or Buddhists or followers of any other religion, we cannot deny the fact that Lord Rama and Krishna were outstanding figures of this country's culture and were the worthy sons of mother India. Irrespective of the religion, that the people of this country follow, is it not a matter of pride for them that these worthy sons are remembered even today after thousands of years? I would like to submit that you may not take Ram as incarnation of the Almighty but you cannot deny or negate the fact that Ram was a national personality.

Sir, this august House is the most prestigious institution of our country where laws are enacted. I remember that during the course of a debate on this issue one of our friends had said that this House was neither a mosque nor a temple, it was a House of Lok Sabha. But Sir, in my views this House is a mosque, a temple, a church, a Gurdwara and as a matter of fact everything for us. In this august House we make laws in the nation's interest and as such whatever is said here should be honourable and dignified and we are the Members of such a prestigious House. A few days back we took oath. Sir, some of us took the oath in the name of God whereas others in the name of truth but I think whether you take the oath in the name of God or in the name of truth it is one and the same thing because truth is also a form of God. As such this House is a temple, a mosque, a church or whatever you consider it to be and the person seat-

[Smt. Vijayaraje Scindia]

ed on the speaker's chair can be regarded as 'Poojari' or a priest or a Maulvi. You are placed in a prestigious position and we are all here to find solution to the problems of the country.

Friends, I would like to submit that we cannot depart from our ancient culture, glory and honour. The society which distances itself from its ancient culture and its glory for the simple reason that they have changed their religion, is a wrong attitude. Religious conversion is something else. Religiosity is a personal matter. But the nation's dignity, glory and its cultural heritage belongs to all of us irrespective of the religion one follows and the same blood flows in our veins. Our ancestors were one and we should be proud of our forefathers to whom we the existence of this country.

As such we should adopt emotional approach to solve this issue. For this country emotional integration is absolutely essential. If we want country's unity, we should first be emotionally united and as all of us are the progeny of Mother India, we should live cordially as one family. We can differ in ideologies whether we belong to Bharatiya Janta Party or Communist or Congress Party. Everyone has full right to follow any ideology. We have right to express our views in this House but we do not have any right to obstruct anybody. It is against the decorum of this House.

As such I request you not to forget your past dignity and glory whether they are my Muslim friends or Christians and with folded hands I would like to tell them that if they forget the past glory of this country they would restrict themselves and remain confined to their limited thoughts whether they are Hindus or Muslims or Christians. I believe that it is not possible to find solution to any of the problems in the event of our confining ourselves to a limited sphere and seeing the world from a narrow attitude.

Today our country is surrounded by many problems. There are economic problems. Apart from this, various secessionist forces are threatening us. The situation is so deteriorated that one day our economic position will so worsen that it will be very difficult to regain it. That day is not far away. Let us come together and solve this issue by mutual understanding and move forward with the belief that Lord Ram is a national figure. Let us not forget that during the age of Lord Ram there were no religions. At that time humanity was the religion. Hence, on the basis of that humanity I would make an appeal to recognize the glory of our country and see Ram temple from that angle. I would also like to request my own countrymen to understand that friction will lead us nowhere. I realize that you are unhappy from the core of your heart. your feelings have been injured and you are unhappy over the fact that for the sake of a great personality, like Lord Ram, we are struggling and fighting so much.

I request you all to go through the pages of history in order to know the fact. We can never make progress and amend our ways by leaving history aside. There was a time when invaders equipped with swords came to our country from outside and forcibly removed sacred threads of our ancestors, cut their *chotis* (braids) and forcibly converted their religion. In that hour of terror and shock, our ancestors met a very harsh treatment at the hands of their own kith and kin. When they sought shelter in their own society, they were treated mercilessly. Naturally, when the man is in trouble he looks to his near and dear for love and sympathy. So, at that time they also looked to their families with a great hope. But doors were closed for them and they were harshly asked to go out because they were supposed to be out-caste then. They did not find shelter in their own houses. I would like to ask whether it was proper to do so? How bitterly would

have they felt then and how bitterly would have they wept when they stood before their houses and the doors of which had been closed for them and no one was there to accept them? Just imagine. After weeping a lot, when they would have come to their senses, they would have departed from there after taking a vow never to come back there even by mistake. Since a man cannot live without a religion or a faith had they embraced another religion in those circumstances, then whose fault it is? It is ours. So, this is the need of the home to create a conducive atmosphere in which we can rectify our mistakes, embrace our own people and learn to respect religious sentiments of others. I expect the same from that side that they respect Rama. They should extend their co-operation in the construction of Rama temple at Ayodhya by rising above this controversy. At present, there are many complex problems in the country. An easy solution to all those problems will come out if we unitedly construct Rama temple there. We should work together to bring emotional integration among the members of the different communities in the country. We should embrace one another and tell that Rama belongs to we all be they Hindus or Muslims or Christians. He does not symbolize any particular community or religion. He is above everything. He is the symbol of the nation. He is acknowledged not only by we Indians but by humanity as a whole as the Maryada Purushottam. As you know, Sir, that even our Aryasamaji brothers consider Him as a grand personality of high ideals though they do not take him to be an incarnation of God. Whenever I go to Ayodhya, I do not forget to pay a visit to a small Gurudwara adjacent to the Ram-Janam Bhoomi where Guru Gobind Singh had spent his time in devotion. I bow my head there in Gobind Singh's honour who is acknowledged as a great Guru. And it is Guru who ultimately enjoins us with Gobind i.e. God. When I had gone there to bow my head, somebody told me that Guru Gobind Singh, after completing his dedication and devotion, had once liberated the Ram-Janam-Bhoomi there. After liberating it he made all the proper arrangements there. But a clash broke out there again after his departure from that place. There has been blood shed from time to time over the centuries in which many people have lost their lives. This issue is not new one, rather this has been going on since the Masjid was constructed there. I praise and give credit to the Muslims of Faizabad and Ayodhya, who never raised such a controversy at least since 1936 over offering their Namaz in that very Masjid.

I appeal to all my Muslim, Christian and other friends not to separate themselves from the name of Lord Rama. Lord Rama belongs to we all. He presents a high ideal for each of us. He teaches us how to lead our lives. I would like to request all of you to tell me whether it is mentioned in any Granth (book) be it Veda or Purana that the word 'Hindu' existed at all during the period of Lord Rama. During that period there was neither Hindu nor Muslim in the country nor was there any Masjid on that place.

I like very much the first half of this Resolution but as far as its second half is concerned, I would like to say you all that there is danger of eruption of clashes again in case this is passed in toto because to my knowledge several Gurudwaras and Mandirs have been built after demolishing Masjids in Haryana, Punjab etc. even after 1947. So, why should we revive those controversies? we should only try to resolve this issue soon by creating conducive atmosphere in order to bring about emotional integrity in the country.

Sir, through you I appeal all of them to come and sit together and not to pay any heed to those who want to appease the people just for the sake of

[Smt. Vijayaraje Scindia]

votes. Let all of us have sout searching. If we have no malice we shall certainly find out some solution to this issue. I say it quite confidently that there after if we are emotionally integrated we would be able to sort out all types of our problems.

With these words I thank you.

[*English*]

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA (Jadavpur): While rising to support this Resolution, I would start by saying that there are two parts of this Resolution. The second part of the Resolution, as a matter of fact, reiterates the proposal of the National Unity Convention held at Lucknow, in April 1950 and attended by many eminent Gandhians like Acharya Narendra Dev and Pandit Sunder Lal. The Congress Party apparently had forgotten about this Resolution for a very long time. However, in a welcome move, recently better late than never, let us say, they have included an almost identical resolution in their manifesto. It has also been included in the President's Address.

Therefore, for this Resolution, we do expect full support from the Congress(I). As for the first part of the Resolution, it is about Ayodhya; and apparently Ayodhya is seen as a special case. In the case of Ayodhya a peaceful settlement of the dispute was recommended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly do not interrupt.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA: Now, I would say that Ayodhya is not a special case. It has been made into a special case. What had been a non-problem has been made into a problem, so that now with hundreds of problems of national status that we have, like whether we would take or not take IMF loan, whether we would liberalise or not liberalise our industrial policy, now we have also to discuss whether or not to allow a temple to be built at Ayodhya. That is how, what had been a non-issue has been made into an issue.

This process started from 22nd/23rd December, 1949 when presumably the diety Ram Lala made his appearance within the precincts of the Babri Masjid. One may well ask why he had waited for all those years. Why not earlier? Why only on that particular night of 1949? But may be, I am a non-believer, may be it will be a sin on my part even to ask such a question. I am refraining for the moment from asking the question. But anyway, Shri Lal K. Advani himself had the grace to say that. I am quoting from the *Hindustan Times* dated 24th September, 1990:—

> "Since at least 1949 the idols have been installed there and worship is going on."

Again,

> "There is no such thing as Babri Masjid now. It might have been there till 1936."

There is a slight anomaly in this. At one time he talks of 1949 as being the cut off date, at another point of time, of 1936. But at least he leaves it open. Whether it is 1936 or 1949, Shri Advani's statement leaves it open that before 1949 or at least before 1936 it might have been a mosque even if now some people may think that it is not a mosque, but a temple. So, if before 1936 or 1949 this structure had been a mosque, then the question arises, "How did it get converted into a temple after 1949 or after 1936? How did it get converted?" Or did it happen in 1986 when the locks were opened.

Well, it was done by the same process which is rightly condemned by our BJP friends when it happened in some of our neighbouring countries such as Pakistan and Bangladesh,

namely forcible occupation of places of worship of a minority community. That is how it was eventually converted *de facto* into a temple after 1986. So, how is something that is acknowledged to be wrong, when it happens in Bangladesh or Pakistan, how is it justified, or become right when it happens in India? This is the question that I would like to ask my BJP friends.

Some of our BJP friends and the Shiv Sena friends have given evidence claiming that at an earlier point of time there had existed a temple at that place and they also gave certain proof regarding its possible demolition.

Now, I would not go into the details. I can only say that all the historical and archaeological evidence that we have of this, exists in the dubious after-thoughts of one archaeologist, Prof. B.B. Lal. It has been largely rejected by the academic community, by the community of archaeologists and by the community of historians.

17.04 hrs. [SHRI P. M. SAYEED *in the Chair*]

There is no evidence of the existence of a temple in any of the Sanskrit texts except one on *Ayodhya Mahatmya* in *Skand Puran*. And all scholars know that Skandapuran is relatively a late text, which included interpolations upto the 18th century. So, that is no evidence. Nor is there any evidence in Tulsi Ramayan. Tulsidas wrote his Ramayan at a time which would be very close to the time when the temple was supposed to have been demolished and he was rather worried about Muslim invasion in India. So, is it not strange that he does not write anything about the demolition of a temple at this site? On the other hand, history has been distorted at a subsequent date, as a matter of fact, it is being distorted very recently. The evidence of that is to be found in a recent near the place where the idol has been put—mural of Babar's soldiers destroying the temple and killing Hindus. And again archaeologists and historians in one voice have said that this is spurious and people who have etched that mural on the wall of the Babri Masjid and defaced it would have much to answer for to the future generations for having distorted history in this manner.

However, let us for argument's sake accept for the moment that such a temple did exist, even that such a temple was demolished at the time of Babar. Even if such a thing did happen, does that justify the conversion of a mosque into a temple in 1991? Does that justify the demolition of a temple? No, it does not.

As a matter of fact, in earlier times, we have found both Hindu rulers and conquerors and Muslim rulers and conquerors have been equally ruthless when places of worship have been seen to be repositories of wealth or of political domination. Even Hindus have destroyed Hindu temples. We found evidence of that in Kalhana's Rajtarangini. There is a plenty of evidence of Buddhist monasteries being destroyed by Hindus, being pilfered by Hindus and images of Buddhist deities have been converted into Hindu deities. And if it comes to that, what about the Hindu images that were pilfered by the British? And many of which are now resting at the British Museum. I would ask our friends from the VHP and the RSS first to launch a movement for the restoration of these images which have been physically carted out from India, taken away from our country. Why do they not launch a movement about this? That should be done.

In 1949, with the forcible occupation of the mosque premises, there

[Smt. Malini Bhattacharya]

was a serious apprehension that the law and order situation may deteriorate. This is precisely why this place was locked and the Order of status quo was passed. So, the contention that has been made by some of the hon. Members that no one said anything at that time about the installation of the idol is not right. Namaz could not be offered at the site since 1949 for the same reason. Then, on February 1, 1986, it was unlocked... (*Interruptions*) All right, you will have your chance. Let me have my say.

It was unlocked by the Order of the District Judge of Faizabad, who said that he was doing it in order to allow darshan to the Hindus. However, this is a decision that was contested and the matter is now pending before the Special Bench of the Allahabad High Court. Earlier one hon. Dixitji said that they have—that is, I suppose, he meant BJP and also VHP, etc—abided by the law. Now is it only the decision of the law that is likely to be favourable to them that they are willing to abide by and a decision that is not likely to be favourable, they are not willing to abide by that? That is not the spirit. It must be remembered that even now the disputed premises remain attached. It is in the hands of the receiver. Four title suits are pending. Is this a religious dispute? It is not a religious dispute. It is a land dispute. It is a dispute on landed and property. There are other claimants to the land. What about the Nirmohi Akhara? They too have suits pending in the law court. As I have said, I am a non-believer. But I regret to say that the VHP and RSS, who are presumed to be believers, have turned Ram Lala, who is regarded as a god incarnate by millions of Hindus, into a petty landlord. What have they done? What does Ram Lala care for that little plot of land if he is a god? I think it is a desecration of the deity for the believers.

Now they are saying that the Government may acquire the land and allow the VHP to construct a temple in the name of Ram Lala. Ram Lala has not been a party to the litigation. So now he is to be made a party in the litigation. So Ram Lala is being made a party to a benami transaction of land. Not only that, his name has been used for certain very large transactions of money. We are told—I am not sure whether it is authentic; there may be people who may answer—that 45 crore coupons not worth less than Rs. 5 were printed by the Vishwa Hindu Parishad in Delhi. Presumably many of these coupons were sold. But where is the money? What has happened to it? Ram Lala did not use a pie of it. Ram Lala has no use for that money. But it was raised in his name. Again Vishwa Hindu Parishad and RSS have never made it clear what they want to do with the structure. There is a great deal of ambiguity about this. At first, they said that they were only interested in the site and not in the construction. What was to be done with this structure? First they used to say quite openly that it would be demolished. I was rather shocked to hear hon. Abedya Nathji again mentioning the word 'todna'. However, they do not say it any longer, not very much. Then it was said that it should be shifted brick by brick. Now this is a very sophisticated technology as all archaeologists know. Do our VHP friends know how much such re-construction of a mosque would cost? Think of the economic crisis that our country is going through. Can we afford this? Where does the money come from for shifting the mosque physically from one place to another? Also why should it be shifted at all? That is the real question.

Much has been said about *bhavana*, emotion. It is interesting that the religious sentiment, a very high thing, I admit, does not seem to inhere in the very sublime, very poetic concept of

incarnation of God becoming man. I am a non-believer, but even I can see the poetry of that concept. But for some people religious sentiment does not seem to inhere in this concept of incarnation but rather in a mere piece of land. Now, Finally we are told No, it is not a mosque, it is not a mosque at all. There is a temple. Actually, we have been moving towards this surreptitiously since 1949. Step by step, we have come to a position where after 1986 after the unfortunate opening of the lock, the place was *defacto* turned into a temple. So, now what is happening is that both site and structure are sought to be appropriated. First, it was only the site. Now, both site and structure have to be appropriated.

Only the other day, Shri Advani was talking of the mandate. I do not know what made him to talk of a mandate. But my interpretation was that because BJP had won the elections in Uttar Pradesh and had formed a Government there, Advaniji is under the impression that may be the people had elected them in Uttar Pradesh to come to power because they promised them to build a Ram Temple there. That is my interpretation, I do not know. Anyway, BJP had not won on the slogan of Ram alone. They added the slogan of *Roti, Insaaf* to Ram. So, how does Advaniji knows that people voted for them because they talked of Ram? May be they voted for them because they talked of *Roti* and *Insaaf*. I do not know whether they will be able to bring *Roti, Insaaf* and Stability to the people. But may be people have voted for them precisely under that impression.

Now you see this temple is the VHP-RSS platform. It is the VHP and the RSS who have been raising the slogan of Ram Mandir. That has been their single platform. So, why are the VHP and RSS using BJP's election victory to make it an occasion for the building of the Ram Temple. This is a question, I would like to ask. Anyway, whose mandate is Advaniji is talking of? He is talking of the mandate of Hindus. The Temple controversy, now is not a matter of UP alone anymore, it has become a national issue. It was made into a national issue. That was precisely the reason why the Rath Yatra—which will make Advaniji immortal to future generations—was undertaken; precisely to make Ram Mandir issue a national issue. So, now it is a national issue. But what is the percentage of Hindus in the total population of our country and what is the percentage of votes out of that totality that the BJP got? Does it show that the Hindus have a mandate for building a temple there? Now, I think, they are aware of this and they know that it would not do, living in India, one could not ignore the minorities particularly the Muslim minority who are somewhat stronger in number. So, now, there is talk of emotional integration. Earlier they were the self-appointed guardians of Hindus. Now they are trying to turn themselves into self-appointed guardians of Muslims also. We have heard of emotional integration. With great respect, emotional integration cannot be achieved through fear. You cannot take a rod and go to a person and say, "I am going to build this temple here; let me see what you can do", and then talk of emotional integration.

I think really that the BJP friends are not in a very happy state over Ayodhya. They are in great difficulty over Ayodhya and this is why again and again the BHP and RSS slogans about Mathura and Varanasi are being used as bargaining counters to achieve Ayodhya. And even that is not enough. They are not secure even with Mathura and Varanasi. From time to time, there have to be more wild slogans about thirty thousand temples that have been demolished. I think that this is just a sign that our BJP friends are not feeling very comfortable in their pre-

[Smt. Malini Bhattacharya]

sent position. May be, they would be very happy if they could get out of the whole thing simply after having managed to get that disputed site in Ayodhya somehow. May be, that is the signal that they are trying to give because now they are in a position from where it is very difficult for them to retract. But let us put it to them that retraction is difficult now for them, may be, it will be even more difficult for them later to retract. So, I think that this proposed legislation is the last chance that they have, and I think that our BJP friends also should be urged upon to accept this Resolution and thus earn the gratitude of the people and not their fear and hatred.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay North-Central): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support this Private Member's Resolution. Of course, the broad structure of the Resolution is to be welcomed very much. We may not agree with all the details which are mentioned in the Resolution but it really touches the very sensitive issue which is before this country for the last so many years. It may be understood that really speaking, this Resolution seeks to put an end to this long drawn controversy. The Resolution merely suggests that the Government should take early steps to peacefully settle the dispute regarding the shrine at Ayodhya. I was glad when I heard Rajmata Vijaya Raje Scindiaji. when she said that she accepts the first part of the Resolution. And I was wondering as to how this different stand has been taken by this leader apart from the stand of the BJP and the other Members of your Party.

AN HON. MEMBER: No difference. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: Then why not pass the Resolution? (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly don't interrupt him.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: She not only said that she agrees with this part of the Resolution, the first part of the Resolution, but she also went on, on this subject by saying that Ram is not the Hindu religious leader, but is the cultural historical figure. *Rasgtriya purush* of this country. And if this approach is there, then I think there are great chances of this dispute being settled peacefully.

Now, Sir, on this sensitive issue we cannot afford to have confrontation in this country at all. As has been said by Shrimati Bhattacharya, when so many economic issues and difficulties are there before this country, we cannot afford to have this confrontation between these two religious communities and say that 'No, we should have no negotiations at all, no negotiated settlement, but we should construct the temple, we should demolish or remove the mosque from that part of the site'. I also do not understand how without demolishing that mosque Ram Temple can be constructed at the place as you are desiring and when you say that 'we do not want to demolish, but we want to remove'—sometimes it was said that brick by brick it will be removed and sometimes, if I am right, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee said, 'Don't you know the technology in Russia? We can remove or move the building itself.' (*Interruptions*).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Andhra technology, not Russian.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: Therefore, the real demand appears to be originally to demolish the mosque and to construct the Temple, and that would create, really speaking, a great confrontation in this country and particularly in Uttar Pradesh. And as Shrimati Bhattacharya suggested, they are in power in Uttar Pradesh now and perhaps they are

also in a dilemma. Then at one stage they said, 'There is a mandate now and we will do it.' It was easy to tell others to do it, but when you are in charge of the matter, it has become a dilemma before you and perhaps that explains the speech of Rajmata. And I suspect that some background is being created to take some turn in the policy. That is also welcome if that is being contemplated by the BJP at this stage.

As far as this issue is concerned, this has been made unnecessarily so much sensitive in view of so many historical things which have come to light. As far as these idols are concerned, it has been an admitted fact that they were installed between 22nd and 23rd of December, 1949.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time is over now. So, the hon. Member may continue on the next Resolution day.

17.30 hrs.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

(ii) **Cancellation of sitting**

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: In deference to the views expressed by several Members and leaders of the parties, if the House agrees, the House may not sit on Saturday. The business of Saturday would be transacted on Monday and we will give more and more time to Members to speak on the Budget. The issue of Shri Shanmugham's death also would be discussed on Monday at 5.00 p.m.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs may make the statement regarding the Government business for the week commencing from 29th July, 1991.

17.31 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business during the week commencing 29th July 1991, will consist of:

(1) Consideration of any item of Government Business carried over from today's Order paper.

(2) Discussion on the Resolution seeking disapproval of the Delhi Municipal Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1991 and consideration and passing of the Delhi Municipal Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1991.

(3) Discussion on the Resolution seeking disapproval of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Ordinance, 1991 and consideration and passing of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill, 1991.

(4) Discussion on the Resolution seeking disapproval of the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Amendment Ordinance, 1991 and consideration and passing of the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Amendment Bill, 1991.