

**Members' Bills and  
Resolutions**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Perhaps after some time he may not feel the necessity of it.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** He is not moving it I believe.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** I am moving it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Perhaps if he has patience and this is adopted, he may not feel the necessity of it in view of the proceedings that we are going to have. Another motion is being made, and perhaps there might be no necessity at all.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** Could I say something more? While we were discussing Shri Anthony's resolution, the consensus of opinion of the House was that the utmost time should be allowed for this resolution, but that the time should not be taken from other non-official business. We are prepared to sit longer for the discussion of the resolution of Shri Anthony.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But he has not said anything, nor can he say, about the time that is to be taken up on the resolution. If the whole time today is spent up on this resolution, why should he need any amendment?

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** That is my point, that one resolution should not be allowed to take up all the time of the day's sitting.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is the next motion, and when that is moved, he might object, not at this time.

**Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon):** He anticipates it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Forty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 5th August, 1959."

*The motion was adopted.*

14.32 hrs.

**RESOLUTION RE: INCLUSION OF  
ENGLISH IN THE EIGHTH SCHEDULE OF THE CONSTITUTION—  
contd.**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now resume further discussion of the following resolution moved by Shri Frank Anthony on the 24th April, 1959:

"That in the opinion of this House, English should be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution and necessary steps taken in that regard."

Three hours were allotted for the discussion of the resolution, but 3 hours and 14 minutes have already been taken up, and thus the resolution has exceeded its allotted time by 14 minutes. I might just find out the sense of the House as to what is the desire here.

**An Hon. Member:** More time should be given.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is going to make a motion.

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** I beg to move:

"That the time allotted by the House on the 24th April, 1959 (vide 43rd Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions) for the discussion of the resolution regarding inclusion of English in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution be increased by 2½ hours."

That is, till the end of today's sitting.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad):** I oppose it.

**Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians):** May I move an amendment to that because I would request you to allow me to reply for at least half an hour? May I with your permission move an amendment that we carry on till half past five so that I may be called at 5 O' Clock?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Why should he wish that? If he wants only that half an hour should be reserved for him, that can be done in some other way.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Then, some others may want to speak, and the Prime Minister. . . .

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If that were the question, then even ten hours would not be sufficient in order to enable all the Members to speak.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Probably the House would be agreeable to sit till half past five, and then I may be called at 5 O' Clock.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** He may reply at 4.30.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I do not think the Members will object.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** Let me say something about the time for this resolution. I have got no objection to the time being increased by any length, but that should not mean that other Private Members' resolutions should be barred. And this motion giving 2½ hours more to this resolution would mean that no other resolution can come up today. So, that time should be taken from Government time.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But what can I do? If the House takes a decision that it is to be extended by 2½ hours and the whole day is to be taken, what can I do?

**Shri Tangamani (Madurai):** It should be 2 hours and 29 minutes.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh):** May I suggest that we should sit today till 5.30? Shri Anthony may be called upon to reply round about 5 O' Clock. He might close at 5.29 and the next Member might be given one minute to move his resolution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is for the House. If the House is prepared to sit after 5, I have no objection. I will certainly sit.

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon):** May I submit that the discussion on the resolution tabled by Shri Anthony must come to a close by 5 O' Clock? I would request you to give at least one minute for the next resolution, so that it can go on record.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But that would not serve the purpose of Shri Braj Raj Singh then.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I do not hold a brief for him now.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That was the only objection taken.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** Since the Government have already expressed their views yesterday through the Prime Minister that they are going to oppose the resolution for nationalisation of banks, I do not know what purpose will be served by a discussion of it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. We should not anticipate the decisions of the House. Then I put the motion to the House.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** My amendment to extend the time by three hours may be put first.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Then there is another that it should be 2 hours 29 minutes.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Or even 2 hours 25 minutes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let this motion be adopted as it is. If the House agrees, we will allow the next Member to move his resolution.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga):** The motion should be amended, because we should conclude the discussion by 5 O' Clock. We should not go beyond the time fixed for the sitting of the House. What is the necessity? The resolution has been discussed.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. The question is:

"That the time allotted by the House on the 24th April, 1959

(vide 43rd Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions) for the discussion of the resolution regarding inclusion of English in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution be increased by 2½ hours"

The motion was adopted

Mr Deputy-Speaker: Subject to that motion we proceed further Shri Munisamy has to continue his speech

Shri N. R. Munisamy (Vellore): The other day I was stating that the sponsor of the resolution had limited its scope to the enrichment of Hindi by assimilating the forms, style, and expressions used in other languages including the English language. It is for this purpose he wanted English to be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution.

The caption of the Eighth Schedule is only "Languages". I find neither the word "national" nor the word "regional" in the caption. These two words are very often used by many of our Members both inside and outside the House. We are using these two words *ad infinitum* without understanding their implications.

I do not find these two words being used anywhere in the entire Constitution, but on one occasion the Prime Minister stated that though the word "regional" or "national" was not used in the Eighth Schedule, the 14 languages enumerated therein referred to national languages. That would mean that we have to distinguish between the national languages and the official language, the official language being Hindi. The framers of the Constitution avoided this ambiguity by avoiding the use of the words "regional" or "national".

Article 351 clearly states

"It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of the Hindi language, to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India

and to secure its enrichment by assimilating without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in the other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule, and by drawing, wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages."

The following words might be noted here, namely 'and in the other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule'. Now, the question is whether English should be regarded as one of the languages of India. And that is the only point which we have to decide now. If really English is to be regarded as one of the languages of India, then it is but natural that this demand should be conceded. But the question is whether it should be regarded as one of the languages of India or not. My answer to this question is that it is a language of India now, though it was not a language of India some time back. I say it with a certain amount of assertion that it is a language of India, because a sizeable number of people here in India speak the English language. But, two or three centuries back, English was not a language of India.

As regards the question whether it could be regarded as one of the regional languages, I would say that just as no one region can be ascribed to Sanskrit or Urdu, likewise, in the case of English language also, no one region could be ascribed to it. I wonder whether we could ever say that we could ascribe a certain territory or a certain region to Sanskrit or Urdu. I can understand Assamese being ascribed to Assam, Bengali to Bengal, Gujarati to Saurashtra, Tamil to Madras, Telugu to Andhra Pradesh and so on and so forth, but I do not think Sanskrit and Urdu could be ascribed to any particular region. Sanskrit, for instance, was an ancient and classical language. It is a language which has

[Shri N. B. Munishamy]

been developed by learned scholars and men of erudition. But we cannot say that it was a language of India some five thousand years back. When the Aryans invaded India, they came with the Sanskrit language. So, Sanskrit was a language which came to India. So, from the point of view of time we cannot say that some five thousand years back, it was a language of India.

So also is the case with Urdu. When Mohammed Ghazni and Mohammed Gory invaded India, round about 600 to 800 A.D., there was no Urdu language in India. It was only after the invasion of India by the Mussalmans between 600 and 800 A.D., that this language had come to India; and when they displaced the rajahs of Delhi, and they had their own governors, Urdu became the court language of India. So, Urdu was not a language of India some thousands of years back. But it is a language of India today, though we could not ascribe any territory or any region for this language.

Likewise, about two or three centuries back, English was not a language of India, but it is a language of India today, for this reason that a sizeable number of people are speaking it; and after five thousand or two thousand or even a thousand years later, the future generation would say that we had rightly included that language, because that language would be at that time just like what Sanskrit or Urdu is in India today. Therefore, historically, traditionally and culturally speaking, I should say that this language must find a place in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon Member must try to conclude now. He had taken five minutes on the last occasion, and he has taken seven minutes today.

Shri N. B. Munishamy: May I request you to give me three more minutes,

because I was also one of the sponsors of the resolution?

I would respectfully submit that India is a cradle of civilisation; India is a cradle of cultures. People with different cultures have come to India, and people speaking different languages have come to India, and we have done so much for them. India is known for its hospitality, and therefore, from the point of view of culture, history and tradition, I should say that this language should find a place in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. The reason which I have stated is quite enough for this purpose, though, of course, there are other reasons which I shall presently place before the House.

Now, people are somewhat afraid that if this language were to be included in the Eighth Schedule, it might be possible later on to utilise it for all practical purposes. But nowhere in the Constitution do I find any article enjoining or authorising that there should be complete supersession of English by Hindi. I do not find any article to that effect in the Constitution. On the contrary, I find that there is scope for continued use of English even after the target period; that is safeguarded, because for so many purposes, English has to be utilised.

I would say that English language was the only language which has made it possible for the Indian Union to be united and solidly kept, and the same language will continue to keep it so.

After the report of the Kher Committee on the Official Language was submitted, there has been a good deal of agitation. There has been supersession of English both at the Centre and in the States; and each State is trying to go its own way by developing its regional language, not giving precedence even to the Hindi language. Hindi language is not being spread all throughout India, for this reason that the Centre is very

slack in the granting of money, the result is that so many non-Hindi speaking areas are not able to promote or develop that language. I would request that the Centre should take this point into consideration and grant more money with a view to see that the Hindi language is properly spread.

It is said that we have got Hindi as the official language of India. In so far as the deliberations of Parliament are concerned, I dare say that we do not have Hindi only as the official language appearing in the debates, here, all the fourteen languages are represented. I do not mean that there should come a time when everyone of the Members representing a particular region must speak in his own language, and they will insist upon their speeches being recorded in their own languages in the Debates. In that case there will arise this difficulty that people will be speaking in their own languages, and a simultaneous translation of the speeches in the different languages will have to be there, just as we have it in the UN and other places. Therefore, I would say that English should continue for some more time. I am sure that in the process of time, English would certainly run away from India, and Hindi will take its place.

I would say one thing more, and that is that we are members of the Commonwealth and, therefore, we cannot afford to ignore English. We are having close association with UK and USA, and we are also having so many schemes for the improvement of industry and for scientific development and so on. Therefore, I would say that English cannot be ignored so easily and so very lightly.

Everybody thinks that the supersession of English is the only practical way. I would, however, point out that it is not so easy to supersede English in that way. After all, what is insisted upon by hon. Members is that there must be a flexible approach and a practical approach. Having

learnt the lessons from past experience of the agitation that has been taking place in South India, we cannot afford to ignore and disregard those lessons and say that Hindi be introduced, in a very hasty manner.

I would only plead with the Hindi-speaking areas that the inclusion of the English language in the Eighth Schedule is not going to hamper the progress of India in any way. On the other hand, we shall have a weapon in our hands, because the English people were driven away by the use of the English language, not by any other thing. That does not mean that we would again invite Britishers to India. This English language is a weapon with which we can drive away any aggressors having any bad design over India. I would, therefore, urge that the English language must be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution.

पंडित ब्रजनारायण ब्रजेश (शिवपुरी)

उपस्थित महोदय मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्यों को जो कुछ कहना होगा ब्रह्म दस मिनट में खत्म करेगे क्योंकि बहुत से सदस्य बालना चाहते हैं।

पंडित ब्रजनारायण ब्रजेश मैं आपकी आज्ञा को शिरोधार्य करके गया ही करने का प्रयत्न करूँगा।

इंग्लिश का राष्ट्र भाषामा की सूची में सम्मिलित करने के लिये जो सप्ताह सदन के सामने आया है उसका विरोध हम इसलिये नहीं कर रहे हैं कि हमको किसी भाषा से शत्रुता है। हम तो केवल यह देख रहे हैं कि हमारे देश में एक लम्बे समय से दासता चली आ रही थी और उस दासता का मूलोच्छेद करने के लिये सभूचे देश ने एक झंडे के नीचे सगठित होकर, एक नेतृत्व के अन्तर्गत युद्ध आरम्भ किया और हमारा वह युद्ध बड़ा

## [संक्षिप्त वक्तव्याराधन वक्त्रेण]

आन्तिपूर्व युद्ध था, मैत्री पूर्ण युद्ध था। हमारी केवल यह मांग थी कि हम जाग्रत रह गए हैं और अपने देश में अपनी संस्कृति, अपनी सभ्यता, अपनी भाषा, अपना आचार विचार और अपनी परम्परा के आधार पर जीवित रह कर हम स्वयं अपने घर का राज्य करना चाहते हैं। इस आधार पर हमने युद्ध छोड़ा था। हमारा युद्ध भी कोई शत्रुता-पूर्ण नहीं था, किसी के प्रति घृणा का भाव रख कर हमने युद्ध आरम्भ नहीं किया था। आज जब देश स्वतन्त्र हो गया है और इस देश में एक शून्यता लाने के लिए, आत्मीयता पैदा करने के लिये और स्वयं देश को एक सूत्र में धाबद्ध करने के लिये हम कटिबद्ध हैं और अपनी भाषा को राज्य भाषा और राष्ट्र-भाषा के स्थान पर स्थापित करना चाहते हैं उस अवस्था में हिन्दी के प्रति घृणा उत्पन्न करके और सभी प्रकार से उसको पीछे हटा कर अंग्रेजी को सामने लाने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है, जिसके कारण हम दबे हुए थे। जिस अंग्रेजियत के द्वारा हमको एक प्रकार से आत्मविस्मृत कर दिया गया था उसे फिर से उठाने की एक योजना चल रही है, ऐसा हमें प्रतीत होता है। इस दृष्टि से हम इसका विरोध करने के लिये खड़े हुए हैं। अन्यथा संसार में फैले हुए ज्ञान को प्राप्त करने के लिए किसी भी भाषा के माध्यम से हम आगे बढ़ सकते हैं, किसी भी भाषा का सहारा ले सकते हैं। इंग्लिश ही क्यों, हम रशियन का भी आदर करेंगे, फ्रेंच का भी आदर करेंगे और किसी और भाषा को भी जिससे हमारे ज्ञान में वृद्धि हो हम आदर की दृष्टि से देखेंगे। उस अवस्था में इंग्लिश से विरोध का कोई प्रश्न ही खड़ा नहीं होता है। परन्तु जो इंग्लिश को भीतर लाकर हिन्दी को बकेलने का प्रयत्न है हम उसका विरोध करते हैं, बकेलने की बात मैं इसलिये कहता हूँ क्योंकि आज लोगों को यह कहा जा रहा है कि केवल इंग्लिश से ही सारा देश

बंध कर रह सकता है। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह भी वास्तव का सूचक है। हमारे देश के दूरदूरी नेताओं ने हिन्दी को राज्य भाषा और राष्ट्र भाषा के रूप में स्वीकृत करके वह समझा था कि देश को एक सूत्र में बांधने के लिये यही भाषा उपयुक्त हो सकती है। हमने हिन्दी को राज्य भाषा के रूप में इसब लिए स्वीकार नहीं किया कि वह बड़ी सम्पन्न और परिष्कृत भाषा है, वह एक प्रौढ़ भाषा है या उसमें बड़ा भारी साहित्य है। हमने उसको इसलिये स्वीकार किया था कि उसके द्वारा हम देश के उन हजारों करोड़ों लोगों से जो कि हिन्दी, बोलते हैं सम्पर्क स्थापित कर सकें और उनकी सहानुभूति प्राप्त कर सकें और उनके साथ मिल जुल कर देश को उठाने का प्रयत्न करें।

हम ने यदि अंग्रेजी भाषा के आधार पर पाठ्य प्राप्त कर लिया है इसलिये आज हम यह कहते हैं कि हम उसी के द्वारा विद्वान बनें रहेंगे और हम अपनी भाषा को बढ़ावेंगे नहीं, या उस में हमारी श्रीवृद्धि नहीं होगी नहीं होगी यह भ्रम आज देश में फैलाया जा रहा है। मैं देखता हूँ कि देश में अंग्रेजी एक-सूत्रता तो जब लायेगी तब लाएगी। अभी तो वह देश को दो भागों में विभक्त कर रही है। जिन को हिन्दी का ज्ञान प्राप्त नहीं है वह समझते हैं कि हिन्दी पढ़े लिखे लोग हर्य पर डामिनेट करेंगे और इंग्लिश पढ़े लिखे लोग पीछे खदेड़ दिये जायेंगे। मेरी तो यह बात समझ में नहीं आती। जो इंग्लिश के पंडित हैं, जिन्होंने एक सम्पन्न और परिष्कृत भाषा का ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है उन को हिन्दी का साधारण ज्ञान प्राप्त करने में कौन सी कठिनाई खड़ी हो सकती है। साधारण दो चार महीने सम्पर्क में रहने के कारण आदमी हिन्दी जान लेता है और अपने भाव व्यक्त कर सकता है। ऐसी अवस्था ।

में यदि हिन्दी राष्ट्र भाषा का स्थान ग्रहण करती है तो हमारा इंग्लिश से सम्बन्ध टूट ही जायेगा ऐसी बात नहीं है। यदि हम इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार कर लेंगे तो मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि जिस दासता के बन्धन से हम निकलने की चेष्टा कर रहे हैं इस प्रस्ताव के कारण हमारा फिर दासता में सम्बन्ध जुड़ जायगा। हम डेढ़ सौ दो सौ साल में बड़ी कठिनाइयों के साथ अपनी स्वतन्त्रता का निर्माण कर सके हैं। हम समझते हैं कि जहाँ तक ज्ञान प्राप्त करने का सम्बन्ध है और उसके लिये जितनी आवश्यकता है उतनी इंग्लिश की पढाई लिखाई आज देश में हो रही है। लेकिन आज देश में सब से बड़ी समस्या यह खड़ी हो गई है कि लोग यह आपत्ति उठाते हैं कि आज इंग्लिश को देश में इतना बढ़ावा दिया जा रहा है कि उस के कारण हिन्दी को जो स्थान प्राप्त होना चाहिये था वह नहीं प्राप्त हो रहा है। देश में भारतीयता पैदा करने के लिये यह आवश्यक है कि हिन्दी को प्रायः बढ़ाया जाय। आज प्रवस्था यह है कि अगर कोई आदमी हिन्दी में बोलता है तो अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे लोग यह समझते हैं कि वह एक गवार के साथ बात कर रहे हैं। हिन्दी में बात की जाती है तो लोग समझते हैं कि यह कोई बिना पढा लिखा आदमी है। जब लोग इंग्लिश में बात करते हैं तो समझते हैं कि हम बड़ी उच्चता की स्थिति पर पहुँचे हुए हैं। आज देश में इस स्थिति का निर्माण हो रहा है। इसी प्रवस्था को स्थायी बनाने की चेष्टा की जा रही है। एक तरफ आज हिन्दुओं को ईसाई बनाया जा रहा है और दूसरी ओर अंग्रेजी को और उच्च स्थान दे दीजिये फिर देश का कल्याण हो जायगा। चौबे जी गये में छब्बे बनने और दुबे ही रह गये वाली कहावत चरितार्थ हो जायगी। और हम पुनः दासता की ओर बढ़ जायेंगे। यह बात गम्भीरतापूर्वक सोचने की है कि यह जो चीख रही जा रही है यह हमारी एकता को तोड़ने वाली सिद्ध हो सकती है।

घाब जब परिस्थितियाँ बदल रही हैं और हम धीरे धीरे देश को भागे बढ़ा रहे हैं उस वक्त यह सोचा जाता है कि अंग्रेजियत को और प्रायः बढ़ाया जाय और अंग्रेजी और अंग्रेजियत को भागे बढ़ाने की चेष्टा की जाती है। हम यह नहीं चाहते कि हिन्दुस्तान में अंग्रेजी बिल्कुल न रहे या अंग्रेजी जीवित न रहे लेकिन हिन्दी के प्रति और हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति आदर और प्रेम की दृष्टि रखते हुए रहे। अंग्रेजी के द्वारा हमारे ज्ञान की वृद्धि हो सकती है इस दृष्टि से उस को बढ़ावा मिलना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हम धीरे धीरे अंग्रेजी से अपना पल्ला छुड़ा रहे हैं उस समय उस को इस प्रकार प्रविष्ट करने का जो प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है उस को किसी भी प्रकार से इस सदन को स्वीकार नहीं करना चाहिये। मैं इस दृष्टि से यह नहीं कहता कि हमारी इंग्लिश के प्रति घृणा या शत्रुता की भावना है। हम यह केवल इसलिये कह रहे हैं कि अब अगर इंग्लिश को इन प्रकार प्रवेश दिया जायगा तो लोगों के मन में यह भाव उद्दीप्त होगा कि हमारा कार्य बिना अंग्रेजी के नहीं चल सकता जैसाकि आज कहा जा रहा है। और जब लोगों के मन में यह भाव पैदा हो जायगा तो फिर हिन्दी के प्रति उन के मन में जो उत्साह उत्पन्न हो रहा है वह ठंडा पड़ जायगा। मैं अपने अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे भाइयों से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि यदि वे थोड़ा भी प्रयत्न करे तो वे हिन्दी का ज्ञान प्राप्त कर सकते हैं और अंग्रेजी के ज्ञान से भी श्री सम्पन्न रह सकते हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मेरा निवेदन है कि अंग्रेजी जहाँ अपने स्थान पर देश में है वहीं रहने दी जाय। उस को और अधिक सम्मान के आसन पर बिठाने की चेष्टा करना उचित नहीं होगा।

Dr. P. Subbarayan (Tiruchengode):  
Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I find myself rather in a difficult position, having expressed my opinion already in the dissenting Minute that I appended to

[Dr P. Subbarayan]

the Report of the Official Language Commission presided over by our distinguished friend, the late Shri B G Kher Still, I hope people will forgive me for emphasising my point of view

There is a slight misconception over Shri Frank Anthony's Resolution They feel that his Resolution deals with the question of official language I do not think that that is the intention of Shri Frank Anthony at all His intention is only to have English included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution

Some objections have been put forward to this because the Eighth Schedule is supposed to contain the national languages of India, languages spoken by a number of people in various regions, I do not say 'regional languages' because then Urdu will not find a place Urdu finds a place because it happens to be the language of my friend

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sa'aram) Jammu and Kashmir State is there

Dr. P. Subbarayan: My hon friend Dr Ram Subhag Singh, corrects me by saying that it is the language in Jammu and Kashmir

An Hon Member: In Andhra also

Dr. P. Subbarayan: In Andhra, it is not Even in Jammu and Kashmir, I have been told when we went to Srinagar that the language of the region is Kashmiri and not Urdu Urdu may be the spoken language of the majority of the people there

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. They have adopted Urdu script, but the language spoken is Kashmiri

Dr. P. Subbarayan: Therefore the question to be considered is whether we could adopt and recognise English as a national language I contend we could, for the simple reason that the intelligentsia of this country for nearly two centuries have adopted

English as their language, not because they talk it at home nor because it is their mother tongue, but it has been used in various cases, in official positions, in the matter of medium of instruction even in schools before the new policy of regional languages came in Till 1937 in my own State, English was the medium of instruction from the primary classes right up to the University stage Even now in Universities in most parts of our country, it is still the medium, and I think it is a very good thing that it remains so, for the simple reason that it is the one language which could be understood by most of the people Unless we have one medium of instruction in Universities—I have said that in my dissenting Minute also—we cannot maintain the unity of India I could very well imagine Hindi after having become the official language, becoming the medium of instruction in Universities, because to that extent, it would help to keep the unity of India The unity of India is far more precious to me than any linguistic quarrel or linguistic controversy that might arise And, if unity is to be kept, I think the medium of instruction at least at the university stage should be one language And as unity is not possible at this stage and as even the Committee of the two Houses has said that a certain number of years will have to elapse before Hindi can become the one official language of the Union, I feel it is only proper that English should find a place in the Schedule

I do not mean to say that it will help the growth of Hindi That is a case which has got to be considered as well But what makes me afraid of the future of English is movements like my friend Shri Braj Raj Singh's party's—*Angrez ko bhaga do*—meaning that English should be driven out altogether That rather frightens me because I think English has contributed a great deal towards our unity English has contributed



a great deal to the growth of knowledge.

At Bangalore when Shri C. V. Raman was questioned by the Chairman he said that English opened many windows of knowledge and 'today what I am as a scientist is because I learnt English. It is not that I am not proud of my own language Tamil because I was educated in Telugu because I was born in a Telugu area.' He said there are things in Tamil of which he was always proud though he could not read them himself because he learnt Telugu

Still English has its own use as I said and I think it is only correct that English should find a place in the Schedule I do not think any harm would be done by including it in the Schedule because as I have said in the beginning itself it does not settle the question of official language in any manner That is a matter which has got to be settled in Parliament and we have already provided in the Constitution that the official language eventually should be Hindi And, I do not think anybody is quarrelling with that. But I think it will be a great gesture to a minority like the Anglo-Indians who are a very small minority, but who are still recognised as citizens of this country, that English should find a place in the Schedule I do not think we need close our minds to this We are all emotional when the question of language is concerned I think emotion should also be governed by reason and I feel reason demands the inclusion of English in the Eighth Schedule

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I should like to try to look at this controversy from a slightly different point of view, a line which was touched by Dr. Subbarayan towards the conclusion of his speech.

At the very outset I should like to plead with the House that the man-

ner in which free India looks at the question of English should be fundamentally different from the way subject India was looking upon English. That was a language . . . (Interruption).

You will hear me if you hear me patiently

That was a language at that time imposed by an alien rule. Such kind of use to which we are employing English now for is entirely a matter of free choice The stigma of slavery and imposition does not attach to it.

I have been a protagonist of Hindi and I take pride in it. At a very early age I learnt Hindi though I am afraid because of the fear of expressing myself in this House. This I only say to remove any misunderstanding

I would like to say another thing. It is this that this inferiority complex towards English is likely to lead to two different but equally detestable results. One is the irrational hostility towards English if we approach it in a spirit of inferiority complex; and another, equally bad of course, an irrational embracing of English. My endeavour will be to approach it from a slightly different angle.

At the very outset before I come to it I make this grievance again. Let not the bitter memories of the yoke of the English or the memories of the baton of the Anglo-Indian sergent cloud our vision or influence our judgment when we make up our minds. We are not debating, as some speakers have tried to say, the question of the official language or national language of India. Shri Brajesh to whom I always listen with interest made a speech which would have been eminently suitable if we had been debating the question of the national language of India. Today what we are doing is something very different. It is that English be given a place in the Eighth Schedule.

[Shri Nath Pai]

And, what does the Eighth Schedule say?—Language of the people of India. Here I want to ask some few questions and that will be my plea. Do we really look upon the Anglo-Indian community, the smallest of the Indian communities as fellow Indians or not?

An Hon. Member: We do

Shri Nath Pai: If we do, then, there are some inevitable logical conclusions. The past prejudices which many of us in this House may legitimately have because many of us had the baton on our heads should not be allowed to come in the way of reaching this question. Here is a numerically smallest community of our country claiming for a right of remaining in this country, retaining its distinct identity, personality and individuality. Shri Anthony Eden has uttered a word which should stir us. . . (Interruptions)

An Hon. Member: Not Anthony Eden but Frank Anthony

Shri Nath Pai: I am sorry I will never expect him to meet the fate that befell the other Anthony. Shri Frank Anthony has uttered words which for me at least were very touchy. He said: 'I am an Indian, I am proud of it! and every time you refer to me as a foreigner a stab of pain shoots through me.' He has been pleading to put the case of a small community. He is afraid of the reaction of us the majority, the master people of this country. He says: 'I want English to be accepted because it will help the enrichment of Hindi.' That is a subterfuge which we compel him to adopt. He is afraid. What is the fear?

Here is a little community which is worried about its retaining its individuality and identity. Our tradition is so great and we have always brought a spirit of catholicity to bear upon great questions. All religions have found shelter in this country

and that did not mar the glory of India but added new lustre to it. Here is, therefore, this small community pleading this. Give us in this vast country of ours the right to remain loyal to India, dedicated to India, devoted to India; none the less able to retain our special individuality

Prof Mukerjee in, perhaps, one of the finest speeches of the day, a compact speech which I studied, had said thus about English. It led to intellectual emasculation and spiritual devitalisation—a unique phrase of his which he used. If we impose English upon the rest of us such consequences are inevitable

The resolution is saying something different, not the imposition of English on the whole nation. I know the disastrous consequences that are to follow if we try that. We tried hard all our life to get a mastery over English. But I can say with all humility that the only language in which I can express myself with a degree of ease and a degree of confidence is the Marathi language—the Konkani dialect of it. I know one may say it is not Marathi. I think it is the height of arrogance for anyone to tell me that my mother tongue is not Marathi. If Shri Anthony says that English is his mother tongue shall we not extend to him the inalienable right of every Indian in new India that his language will be protected and upheld? Are we serious about giving the Anglo-Indian community the right to live as Anglo-Indians retaining their individuality; or do we want them to go? I want to ask this seriously. Are we to allow the fact that they are geographically dispersed all over the country and the fact that they are numerically small to be turned against them? The strongest single bond which holds a community as a community is the language. This community can preserve its identity by having its language preserved and

protected by us. It is the easiest thing for free India to dispense with a stroke. It does not require debate.

I look upon English from the point of view of the language of the smallest of my brethren, the Anglo-Indian community. Do we want them first to disintegrate? That is what will happen if we do not protect them. I know England is there to protect the literature of Shakespeare, Milton and Byron. I know there is America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. But I have got our brothers here who speak that language.

Shri M. P. Mishra (Begusarai): Under article 29(1) of the Constitution every Indian language which is not even there in the Eighth Schedule has the full right to protection. And there are a number of Indian languages which are not in the Schedule. There are so many languages in India which are not in the Schedule.

Shri Nath Pai: Thank you very much for this. I was asking this question. If we do not take this precaution and offer this protection, what will follow? First, there will be a disintegration of the community and its gradual disappearance from the horizon of Indian history, lost without a trace into the vast ocean of Indian humanity. I do not think this is what many of us would like to happen to the smallest Indian community. I, therefore, plead: let us look at the question raised by him from the point of view of allowing a small community to exist as an Indian community retaining its personality, individuality and identity. If we have this our fears will be removed. I am one with the leader and the champions of Hindi. Hindi is my *lingua franca*; I am proud of it. All our dedication will go to it; all our loyalty will go to it as the national language of India. It will remain so and we only hope that the Govern-

ment will not pay simply lip sympathy to Hindi but will be taking all the steps so that very soon the day comes when we can implement what has been enshrined in our Constitution about Hindi but that is not to be confused with the right of a small community to have its own language preserved in this country.

Having said this about, what I feel, the way of looking at this, I would make a plea also to my Anglo-Indian brethren. Many of us do feel that sometimes just as we should help to preserve their individuality, they should also try to emphasise their identity with the wider entity that is known as India. We hope that there will be more leaders of the calibre and aptitude and approach of Mr Frank Anthony. I must say of a sad experience—he will pardon me—when I was first sailing; in the bathroom on board I was told by my countryman—“You, black Indian, this is not native India.” I was sorry that this kind of attitude prevailed. I do not want to raise a prejudice because that is not my attitude. We have to see that some of them try gradually to identify themselves with the people of this country, in the regions where they exist. Whereas we should make it possible for them to have English, they should make an endeavour to learn the language of the region: if in Calcutta, Bengali; or if in Bombay, Marathi or Gujarathi or both. I do not want to add to the load of this community but there is an expectation that this mutual understanding and harmony should come in place of the present distrust. Many of the speeches, I am afraid, are clouded and overhung with the past prejudices. My plea, therefore, is that we should take up the amendment that we have moved. It is a comprehensive one. We cannot go on amending our Constitution piecemeal. There is the question—to me it is very important—of Sindhi. If Sindhi today does not exist as an identity and entity, it is not the fault of our Sindhi brethren; it is not their fault that the country was divided and

[Shri Nath Pai]

they had to come to us as refugees. Having imposed this fate on them, we ought to see that the language is preserved in this country. Sindhi must not disappear from the map and culture of India. There is also the claim of our Manipuri brethren and with that I will be concluding; there are a few other languages such as Santhal . . . (Interruptions) Hon. Members may think it as a joke. For me it is a matter of pride that this country has such a richness of culture. So, our attitude towards English should be that. This is my appeal to him: he may think once again before pressing this Resolution whether we can go with the spirit of the amendment which my Party has moved. Amendment of the Constitution should not be piecemeal; it should be a comprehensive one. We should provide for the other languages also. Howsoever small a community may be, it has the glory of being born in India. I was born here; this land preserved my identity and helped me. The Anglo-Indian should feel pride and joy which he perhaps does not feel today. So, you should extend this spirit to Sindhi, Santhal, Rajasthani and Manipuri. Let us take this attitude. I will, therefore, plead with him, having pleaded with the House, that we should not try to seek to amend the Constitution piecemeal; but let us consider this and try to find a solution. Thank you very much.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this debate has gone on for a fairly considerable time and I had intended not to participate in it. Not because I am not greatly interested in the subject but right from the beginning, I had felt that in this particular debate, every Member should be free to express his views and give his vote as he chose without any, if I may say so, party pressures or whips or anything like that. And I thought that, even though I had made that clear and it is clear, perhaps, if I spoke,

that itself might be some kind of indirect pressure, although I do not want it to be so. But during the last session, friends pressed me to participate in this debate and I promised to do so and I am, therefore, fulfilling my promise.

To some extent I have tried to prepare myself for this by reading last evening Mr. Frank Anthony's speech when he moved this Resolution and also some other speeches. Taen I went back to the records of the Constituent Assembly when these language matters came up and among other speeches, I read my own which I made almost exactly ten years ago in September, 1948. If I may be permitted to say so, I was rather surprised to see what a good speech I had made there. And I find that really I have little to add to it or to vary it in any way.

My approach to this question is not hidden. I have repeated it on various occasions. It is not an approach of those worthy colleagues of ours whom I would call the Hindi enthusiasts, nor is it the approach of the other colleagues who are the English enthusiasts. Personally, I am an enthusiast for both: Hindi and English—when I say Hindi, I mean the Indian languages also—provided they function in their proper domains and spheres. I do not see any real conflict. There may be overlapping. Necessarily, languages overlap. That is not harmful. They have a good effect on each other but we should avoid this approach of conflict, as if the advance of one language somehow crushes the other. I recognise that in the past of India, English was undoubtedly an imposed language by the power that dominated over India. Therefore, while on the one hand it brought and opened out windows of knowledge, etc. it also had that sting in it—of being a language, sitting on the top of our own languages and our own cultural traditions. That is true. To some extent that memory lingers though we should try to get rid of it and consider these

matters more objectively and impersonally.

In the course of the debate, many aspects of the language issue have been referred to although it is well to remember that Mr. Anthony's Resolution only touches one small aspect of it; it does not cover the rest. It is true also that the moment you touch these matters, immediately you shake up a hornet's nest and all kinds of things—not only language but all kinds of suspicions in people's minds, fears—come up and rather come in the way of calm and logical thought. One cannot help, therefore, looking at this relatively small matter in this larger context. Nevertheless, let us consider it in the smaller context.

Shri Nath Pai, who was just speaking, appealed with eloquence for our helping the Anglo-Indian community to maintain their individuality and all that I am all with him. I just do not see, however, how this particular amendment this way or that way helps or hinders. It is a very very minor matter from the point of view of maintaining their individuality. I am all for it. There are other forces that play in India which will help in maintaining it and other forces which will come in the way; because, naturally, all kinds of forces came to unify India, came to mix us up with each other, and I hope—I am not talking of the Anglo-Indian community, but all of us—that these forces which mingle and commingle us will grow and not keep us in watertight compartments as they do still, and compartments of caste, and the like will actually vanish. If that happens, no doubt, that kind of thing will affect the Anglo-Indian community also, and I think it is a good thing if it happens, not by any pressure but by the natural process of racial integration and all that.

This particular resolution really has no real effect on that, because I recognise that English is and should be considered the mother tongue of the

Anglo-Indian community. By putting it in this list you do not make it more or less a mother tongue, it is that. And, as the House knows, our policy is to encourage education in the mother tongue, whatever it is. We go about in the North-East Frontier Agency teaching people in their tribal languages. Some of them are very imperfect, not developed, nevertheless, we think it important to start their primary education in their own language. If you start in any other language, Assamese, Hindi or whatever it may be—these languages come at a later stage—there is an element of difficulty, of foreignness to the child. If you do that in the case of the tribal languages, surely in the case of the more developed languages that is even more important. Surely, in the case of English it is very important. For people who consider English as their mother tongue,—well, it is for them to decide—it is their mother tongue and they should be given every facility for that.

Shri Anthony referred in his speech, I think, to the so-called Anglo-Indian schools. I do not personally know much about them, so I dare not say much; but without knowing much I would say this, that any facility for Anglo-Indian education should be maintained, should be continued and should be facilitated necessarily.

Now, it must be remembered that the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution containing the list of 14 languages is certainly not an exhaustive Schedule of Indian languages. Obviously, not. There are other languages which are not mentioned there, quite a number. In fact, in the amendments to this resolution I see odd languages mentioned saying that they should be included. Therefore, you must not consider that the non-mention of a language means that it is not an Indian language or is not a language used in India. That is not correct.

Take another language not so much used in India. There are plenty of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Indians who have French as their mother tongue in Pondicherry and elsewhere. We have promised to honour French in Pondicherry and to encourage it. We are encouraging it, and it is the language of that little State of Pondicherry today; education, law, judiciary, medical, teaching and other matters are done in French there. What will happen in the distant future I do not know. It may be that before too long a very considerable number of Portuguese-speaking people will also be within our country. Many are within our country today, outside Goa. But, no doubt, Goa will come, and we have even now given the assurance that the Portuguese language of Goa will be honoured. We respect it and it will be a language of India in so far as those people are concerned.

So my outlook is somewhat different. I am not referring, of course, to all the other languages which are more typically Indian all over the place. There is Sindhi, a very important language. Sind may have gone, but a large number of Sindhi-speaking people of eminence have come here with their language. Because of that, you know, so far as the Sahitya Akadami is concerned, deliberately we have included English and Sindhi in our list, because we were dealing with a practical problem of encouraging the publication of book in languages which we considered to be of importance to India. We had the whole list, of course, of the Eighth Schedule, and we had English and Sindhi. That is all right. It shows our friendly attitude to encourage English; not at the expense of the 14 or any other—of course not—but we felt that English had a peculiar importance—not because, if I may say so with all respect, the Anglo-Indian community considered it their mother tongue, but for wider reason; because it has been and will continue to be a window to us to all kinds of activities,—thinking etc. Therefore, we included it, and one of our chief purpose in the Sahitya Akadami is to

translate from one Indian language to another, translate from English to an Indian language, translate from an Indian language to English etc., and quite a number of translations have come out.

Now, therefore, my first point is that the Eighth Schedule is not an exclusive list of Indian languages. It is a list of the more widespread, if you like, Indian languages, spoken by large numbers of people. There are quite a number which are not included, which are very much Indian languages. Secondly, so far as education etc. are concerned, we lay stress on the mother tongue, not on the 14 languages but on every other mother tongue that is in India—certainly on English, certainly on French, certainly on Portuguese, leave out the typical Indian languages, and certainly on the tribal languages—so that there should be and there is no burden on the Anglo-Indian community or anybody who consider English or any other language as their mother tongue.

Now, there is article 347 of the Constitution. It says:

“On a demand being made in that behalf, the President may, if he is satisfied that a substantial proportion of the population of a State desire the use of any language spoken by them to be recognised by that State, direct that such language shall also be officially recognised throughout that State or any part thereof for such purpose as he may specify.”

“Any language”, not a language of the Eighth Schedule. It is the right of people speaking any language, if they are sufficient in numbers, to request the President to declare it as the officially recognised language for that area. He may do that. And it is obvious that this is not confined to the 14 languages; any language can come. It is a different matter whe-

ther conditions prevail for any other language to be so, but the point is that the Constitution definitely thinks not of the 14 languages mentioned in the Eighth Schedule only but also of other languages. And, so far as English is concerned, of course, it is mentioned in the Constitution in various places rather specially.

As Shri Anthony himself said, this question of language whenever it comes up rather clouds our vision because of our emotion. There are psychological and other reactions to it, and that is the real reason for this kind of debate, otherwise, I do not think it makes much difference if you add or subtract a language because that is not an exclusive list, as I said.

It is true that the Indian languages have suffered psychologically and otherwise, yet they have gained a great deal too naturally from contacts with the wider world. They have suffered to a large extent.

Some hon. Member I forget who it was, perhaps it was Shri Nath Pai or somebody else, who said—

Mr Deputy-Speaker Pandit Braj Narayan "Brajesh"

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. He put the idea that a person who knows English is a superior person to a person who does not know English. They have suffered from that to an extent and still they suffer to a certain extent. It is gradually going away, but it is still there, and there is a bad thing. That kind of feeling is a bad thing.

I am rather partial to English. I consider English important, not, if I may say so, for many of the reasons advanced here—those reasons, I think, are relatively unimportant—but for some entirely different reasons. But I do think that it is a bad thing if in India this feeling perseveres, that a person who does not know English he may be a scholar in his own language—is somehow inferior to the other person who knows very imperfect English or whatever it is.

An Hon. Member: There is a feeling

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. That is not a good feeling. In fact I go further. I think it is quite essential that a person, even though he belongs to some rather primitive group, whoever he may be—though you might think that he belongs to some rather primitive group—must respect his own culture. If you go and deal with some of the tribal folk—the tribal folk of course differ greatly, some of them are highly advanced and some are not—the first thing, I believe, is to make them respect themselves, never make them have contempt for themselves or their people. It is a bad thing. When I say that about the tribal folk, how much more does it apply to others? There has been this feeling and there has been this separation in India of the so-called English-knowing and the English-speaking people from the masses of humanity in India, whether they are Hindi-speaking or Marathi-speaking or Bengali-speaking or Tamil-speaking. That of course is partly going but it has been there and that has to be very definitely removed. A scholar of Hindi or Tamil is infinitely better than a person who knows indifferent English, obviously he is better. He knows something well.

Take another aspect of it. Whether you like it or not I like it. The medium of instruction in India is becoming an Indian language, of a region or of the State, call it what you will. There is no doubt about it. The real importance of English in the past was that it was the medium of instruction. Many of us have grown up learning it as a medium of instruction. We cannot get out of it, but the next generation is getting out of it. The generation after that will be completely out of it, and that is the real change that is coming, not your Schedules and all that. The medium of instruction is Hindi or Tamil or Telugu or Marathi or Gujarati or Bengali or whatever it is. Progressively it is coming like that. I do not wish to force the pace anywhere.

[Sri Jawaharlal Nehru]

My friend Dr. Subbarayan talked about university education with one language. I do not know. I should like that. But I do not want Parliament or the law to force the pace. I want things to develop naturally, imbibing the good things of the past and the present, because I dislike pressure in the case of language. I dislike imposition in the case of language. Therefore I dislike Hindi enthusiasts trying to impose Hindi. I dislike it. Well, equally I dislike the idea of imposing English. I feel all these things should be allowed to grow naturally, giving a certain help and direction now and then and allow things to be developed.

Now, the major change that has come over India is that the medium of instruction has become—in the schools, high schools, it has already become—the language of the State. English is used certainly,—a good thing too—and I am all for it especially in the universities. But the medium of instruction in the regional language is a big break linguistically from the past. It does not matter where you put it in, in what Schedule, or what the Official Language Commission says or does. They are important for their own reason but the real thing is that the medium of instruction has changed. Therefore, you can only consider English as a secondary language, or if you like, a compulsory secondary language; if you like, a highly important language, a language which is not the medium of instruction but which is learnt as a separate foreign language. That has become inevitable. I think it is right.

There are certain risks and dangers in all this—linguism or the languages developing and becoming rather autarchic or developing certain separate-ness. There are certain risks. We cannot ignore them and we should deal with them. We should fight that tendency; but, mind you, we cannot fight it by trying to come in the way of the developing of the regional languages. That is a wrong

way. We must encourage their fullest development because I believe it is through that development that they can come together and come nearer to each other; not by one language trying to push the other like the exceedingly futile debate for a generation or two generations or more that took place in Uttar Pradesh or the old United Provinces about Hindi and Urdu and each so-called language,—the languages may be more or less the same with minor differences—not trying for its own growth but trying to smother the other, trying to sit on the other and trying to blame and condemn the other. It is an amazing thing, but it goes on still to some extent. Some Hindi enthusiasts get angry if somebody speaks of Urdu not knowing that they cut their own hands and feet by talking against Urdu, because Hindi and Urdu help each other. They do not hinder each other; they help each other, add to the growth of each, and the moment you try to hinder the one you hinder yourselves from growing.

Therefore, I think we have to take that risk, the risk of language separatism. There is no help for it. I think we shall get over it undoubtedly, but we should get over it if we encourage the right tendencies and not impose our will on others.

Now, take Hindi. Hindi is at present objected to by many people in the South. Why? Well, because of a feeling of imposition and not because they are against Hindi. As a matter of fact I think there are vast numbers of people in the South learning Hindi and learning it very well. The process is going on, but the moment you talk of any kind of imposition, quite rightly they get angry. And, therefore, all talk of imposition must go. I should go further and tell them, if they do not want to learn Hindi let them not learn Hindi. Let us gradually, if they want to, make this approach and thereby you would bring them nearer to each other.



There are, of course, many other things I am not discussing the whole question of language, but again I repeat that the big thing that has happened in India is that the medium of instruction has changed from English to the regional languages. Other things are secondary.

Also, it was right and essential for this medium of instruction to change and for our education to be in those languages if we have to deal on a level with the masses of our people. There is no other way. Now, remember, I repeat, I am partial to English, and I will say something about that presently. But I am also partial to our people, the masses of this country, not because of my partiality for English or foreign knowledge or scientific and technical knowledge—I am partial for them—but I just can not forget that we have to carry 400 million people with us and not an elite, a few thousands or even a million or two if you like, and you cannot carry them practically, psychologically, emotionally in anyway except through their language. So you have to deal with those languages, you have to deal not only with them but ourselves too.

Therefore, it is for all these reasons that, although Mr Anthony's resolution does not make a mighty difference this way or that way, I do not think it is a wise resolution or a wise step to take. I do not think it will make any difference. It would not help the Anglo-Indian community but it may very well hinder not the Anglo-Indian community, but the process he wants to encourage by bringing in another bitter dispute, fears and apprehensions. I want to avoid that. I want natural processes and not make a constitutional amendment. Suppose at the time of framing the Constitution, the Constituent Assembly put in English there at that time, there it would have remained. But now to go out of our way to put in any language will obviously open the doors to so many other languages coming in. Apart from

that, it will open the door to infinite controversy and conflict.

It will be injurious to English in the end, because, remember, in the final analysis, it is no good forgetting that it is the non-English-knowing people who will decide the fate of India—I do not say "Hindi-knowing", but "non-English-knowing"—because they are the vast majority in this country. Naturally, how can we escape that? We can help them, we can to some extent mould their thinking and direct them, but the moment you make them feel that you are up against them, then you are lost, you will be swept, with all your English and everything. Therefore, I do not think it is wise to raise these things.

But I do think that essentially we have to encourage our languages, our education and our work must be progressively in our languages to keep in touch with the people and to bring them into the emotional contact with what is happening in your Governments and elsewhere. It does not matter I am speaking in English, it is because I am habituated to it, and it does not matter. But I know that the right thing to do is to speak in a language understood by far more people. So, I think that has to be done.

Dr Subbarayan referred to the official language. Our Constitution has laid it down, for a variety of reasons into which I need not go, that Hindi should develop progressively as that, not because Hindi is better or more powerful or whatever it may be, than the other languages, but for certain very practical reasons of extent etc. I believe, that this should be done.

I believe also two things. As I just said there must be no imposition. Secondly, for an indefinite period—I do not know how long—I should have, I would have, English as an associate additional language which can be used not because of facilities and all that, though there is something in that, but because I do not wish the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

people of the non-Hindi areas to feel that certain doors of advance are closed to them, because they are forced to correspond—the Government, I mean—in the Hindi language. They can correspond in English. So, I would have it as an alternate language as long as people require it and the decision for that, I would leave not to the Hindi-knowing people, but to the non-Hindi-knowing people

I will repeat what I mean Hindi progressively develops; I try for that, but I love English to come into the picture to be used as long as people require it. Some States have followed it; they can go on using it and gradually allow languages to develop and to replace English.

Having said that, I should like to say a few words about English itself. Really the question of Hindi versus English is a very minor issue; it is not the real issue at all, although there is so much argument, if you look at it from my point of view, the way I have put it. I come to English and its importance. It is not important, if I may say so, because a number of people know it in India, although it is a factor to be remembered. It is not important because it is the English of Milton and Shakespeare, although that also has to be considered. There are also great poets in other languages—French, German, Russian, Spanish, etc., apart from Asian languages. It is important because it is the major window to the modern world for us. That is why it is important and we dare not close that window. If we close it, it is at the peril of our future.

We talk about our Five Year Plan, industrialisation, science and technology. Every door of that is closed if you do not have foreign languages. You need not have English; you can have French, German or Russian, if you like, but obviously it is infinitely simpler for us to deal with a language we know than to shift over to German or Russian or Spanish. It is a tre-

mendous job. Certainly we want to learn Russian, German, Spanish or whatever it is, because we deal with them in business, trade and science. Every competent scientist today has to know two or three non-Indian languages.

People imagine that by coming a large number of words in Hindi or Bengali or Marathi or Tamil—technical and scientific words—and maybe by translating some text-books, you provide the background for scientific teaching. Certainly, for high schools you do it and maybe it is right that you should do so, although this business of coining words seems to me to have been carried on to rather absurd limits, making a noble language progressively more and more artificial and ununderstandable. It is terrible and I think the chief persons guilty are, not all, but some of the Hindi enthusiasts. They make it very difficult really. Leave out the question of literary forms and graces; in my own small way, I too am a lover of languages and it hurts me, it hurts my aesthetic sense, my conception of language, to see these artificial monstrosities thrust upon me, put up at cross-roads and stations—huge long words, which nobody understands, not the public. I do not know if the man who invented it understands it.

It is a terrible thing and it is more dangerous for the Hindi language than anything else, because you are tying up Hindi with steel bonds, which will prevent it from growing. The creativeness of a language goes if you impose these things. Language is a delicate flower which grows in beauty. You can feed it in various ways; you cannot pull, tug or twist it about and think it will grow.

**Shri Narasimhan (Krishnagiri):** This disease is spreading to regional languages also.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** It is all the worse; I am sorry. It is a bad thing.

It is inevitable that in the present stage of our development, with our Five Year Plan, industrialisation, mechanisation, scientific progress and research, you cannot progress by all the Indian languages put together I say that definitely today and if you want to stick to them only, without foreign languages, you do not go ahead You may have enough science to teach in high schools, you may even get some books for your elementary university course All that should be done, but science is not the BA or the BSc course Science today goes into the jet age, atomic energy, space travel, automation and all that It is a new age and this House should forgive me if I say something, not derogatory to the House, but still rather critical, and that is this House does not represent in numbers I mean, the scientific outlook That is to say, we represent more the literary outlook, the lawyers' outlook and so on and so forth

Shri Hem Barua: The emotional too

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The peasant's outlook too, which is important I do not challenge that But I will say this I was reading a lecture delivered in the Cambridge University a few months ago by an eminent man The lecture was called "the two cultures" He was dealing with the English scene, mind you, not India And he was saying how in England two cultures have developed which were far apart from each other, which did not understand each other, the two cultures being the literary cultures and the scientific culture And he gave examples He said in the hall of the big college at Cambridge there were dons sitting—the scientific dons, the mathematical dons and the literary and the classical dons and they glared at each other; they did not talk to each other, the literary and the classical people, Greek and Latin and all that, on the one side and the scientific and the mathematical people on the other

side They looked with contempt at each other And he said it is extraordinary these two cultures developing—the literary man, he knows nothing about the modern scientific age and the scientific man knows nothing about the treasures of literature If that can happen in a country like England, in a city like Cambridge in a college gathering, people glaring and not understanding each other, professors of a single college, transport yourself to India We are backward in science Our scientists apart, our own thinking is not scientific We use some of the products of science in industrialisation undoubtedly We travel by air, we talk about space travel Maybe we read some fiction, what is called "science fiction" or space fiction or something But essentially we are far far away from this age, the atomic age in our thinking Naturally, it is not surprising If the English literary men who live in a highly industrialised country cannot fit into that mentally how much more difficult will it be for us who are industrially backward scientifically backward and in other ways not used to that

We have some professors teaching science We have some technologists They are growing, of course, and there we are on the threshold of an industrial revolution in India Now that industrial revolution cannot, in the present age—I am not talking of the future ages—be carried out, because we have no literature, no language We have some books on elementary physics or biology or chemistry, but this higher mathematics and all that is really quite beyond our languages, at the present moment. And you cannot have an industrial revolution unless people have access to these and are taught these books in various languages You may translate some You should But it is not enough So, without the knowledge of the foreign language the doors of the new age are closed to you, without the knowledge of several foreign languages I would say, and inevitably the language which is easier to you is English, to come back to it

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

There is another aspect. When I talk of the industrial age and all these other scientific developments, and when we talk about language, a totally new language is developing in the world, a language, if you like, of the elite, the language of the mysterious, the high priests, which average people do not understand. But it is developing with amazing rapidity among the technical people, among the scientific men, a language largely of mathematical formulae. There is very little of the rest there. It is chiefly mathematical formulae which are accepted and as only mathematicians and physicists will understand and for you and me we do not just understand it. And this is developing at a terrific pace, because it has to keep pace with the development of technology, development of so many other things of science and there surely is going to be, I hope, one language in the world, the language of the mathematical formulae. For that we cannot have a separate language; otherwise, the world is lost.

We talk about one world today in theory because of scientific advance, communications and all that. National boundaries hardly count. And I have no doubt that if the world survives long enough there will be one world. But these national prejudices come in the way and we cannot ignore them. At any rate, let us go towards that, and not isolate ourselves. In this connection, I would say a lay small matter which you have decided and I would like to stress on that. It is of the highest importance that you use international numerals progressively—not that you cannot use whatever you like in the private books and things, I have no objection because that again becomes a symbol of the modern age, of science, of mathematics, of formulae and all that. You cannot introduce all that formulae etc. in the Devanagari numerals. You immediately get into a different world. You have to use it. That at least, let us have in common with the world,

common in India to begin with. Then the commonness increases.

[At this stage the alarm of an hon. Member's (Seth Govind Das') watch was heard ringing].

An Hon. Member: That is a signal for you to stop.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know it is a signal from Seth Govind Das. In conclusion I would venture to say that it is of the utmost importance that the people grow from their roots. We cannot uproot, without doing them enormous injury, any people, even the primitive people. We are not a primitive people. We have 5,000 years, 10,000 years background behind us. How can we uproot ourselves? It is an impossibility. We cannot do it. The language becomes a symbol of continuity. What are languages, every language, even the Southern languages? The northern languages are intimately connected with Sanskrit. The southern languages are not connected in that way, but in other ways.

Now, everyone knows that Sanskrit was the symbol and the vehicle of our magnificent civilisation in the past, a tremendous thing. Whenever I think of it I am overwhelmed by the achievement of Sanskrit. It is a tremendous thing. Now we cannot leave it. Let us learn it by all means. But our languages are a continuity, are a cultural tradition from Sanskrit. They keep that continuity deep of the dim past through Sanskrit and for us not to lay stress on that, not to encourage them, not to imbibe them ourselves means that we cut ourselves away from thousands of years of cultural tradition, to cut ourselves away from our people who have that cultural tradition. You may call them illiterate but you dare not call our people uncultured. They are not. They are full of culture even though they may not know how to read and write. So, if this continuity is broken, for an ancient country like us it will

be fatal. We dare not do it. Therefore, we have to develop our language. Therefore, we have to keep in touch with the mass of the people. Therefore, we have progressively to function in those languages.

Now I come back again to the second point, of the modern scientific jet atomic age. We must have a foreign language to open our windows and we must not close our minds to it.

**Shri Nath Pal:** The hon. Prime Minister stated that Portuguese is the language of Goa. Konkani is the language both of the Hindus and the Christians in Goa. Portuguese is the language of the forces of occupation.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I know that Konkani is the language. But we have said that it is entirely for the people there—we have said that as we said in the case of Pondicherry—that if the people there want to carry on with Portuguese they can do so.

**Shri Vajpayee:** May I ask a question of the hon. Prime Minister?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Shri Vajpayee:** He has just now stated... (Interruption).

**Some Hon. Members:** No questions. (Interruption).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. I have called Shri Prabhu Narayan Singh for the present.

श्री प्र० ना० सिंह (बन्दौली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री फ्रैंक एन्थनी के इस प्रस्ताव पर कि अंग्रेजी को कांस्टीट्यूशन के भाठवें शिद्दुल की एक भाषा मान लिया जाये इस सदन में जो बहस चलाई गई, उस के दौरान में यह दलील दी गई कि फ्रैंक एन्थनी साहब एंग्लो-इंडियन कम्यूनिटी को बिलांग करते हैं और साथ ही साथ इस देश में जो फ्रैंक एंग्लो-इंडियन कम्यूनिटी माइनारिटी में हैं, इसलिये उन की जवान को, जोकि अंग्रेजी जवान है, भाठवें शिद्दुल

में रख दिया जाये। इस सम्बन्ध में अभी इस सदन के सामने माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने प्रॉटिकल ३४७ को पढ़ा, जोकि आफिशियल लेग्ज के सिलसिले में है और उस के मुताबिक यह बात साफ है कि यदि किसी इलाके में किन्हीं लोगों की जवान ज्यादा तादाद में बोलनी जाती हो, तो उस के मुताबिक वह उस स्टेट को आफिशियल लेग्ज हो सकती है।

उसी के साथ साथ फंडामेंटल राइट्स के प्रॉटिकल २६(१) में यह बात साफ तौर से कही गई है कि :

“Any section of the citizens residing in the territory of India or any part thereof having a distinct language, script or culture of its own shall have the right to conserve the same.”

तो फंडामेंटल राइट्स में और उसी के साथ साथ आफिशियल लेग्जिज के सिलसिले में कांस्टीट्यूशन बिल्कुल साफ है कि किसी भी अल्पसंख्यक समुदाय की जवान—मातृ-भाषा—जो कोई भी हो, उन को प्रिज कराने का कांस्टीट्यूशन अपनी तरफ से पूरी गारण्टी देता है। लेकिन मुझे इस बात का दुख है कि जो प्रस्ताव इस सदन के सामने माननीय फ्रैंक एन्थनी साहब के द्वारा रखा गया है, उस के पीछे उद्देश्य कुछ और ही है। यदि केवल इतना सवाल होता कि एक माइनारिटी कम्यूनिटी की मातृभाषा को—मदर लेग्ज को—कांस्टीट्यूशन के भाठवें शिद्दुल में रख दिया जाये, तो हमें कोई एतराज न होता, लेकिन हमें यह कहते हुए कोई हिचक नहीं है कि आज जो यह रेवेन्यू-ल्युशन इस सदन के सामने है, वह केवल इस वजह से नहीं है कि एक माइनारिटी कम्यूनिटी को लेग्ज को भाठवें शिद्दुल में रख दिया जाय, बल्कि इसलिये है कि माननीय फ्रैंक एन्थनी साहब अंग्रेजी जवान को इस देश में आने वाले जमाने के लिये—आने वाले सालों के लिये लगातार कायम रखना

[श्री प्र० ल० सिंह]

चाहते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं इस राय का न बनना, बरि मैंने कमेटी आफ पार्लियामेंट ऑफ आफिशियल लैंग्वेज की रिपोर्ट में उन के नोट आफ डिसेंट में यह न पढ़ा होता—

“A vital defect in the approach of the Committee was that it declined to take any further evidence in spite of the vastly changed atmosphere in the country and the increasingly widespread opposition to the imposition of Hindi. Thus the Committee ignored the unanimous decision of the Legislature of West Bengal that they could not accept Hindi as the official language and that the *status quo* should continue.”

अगर माननीय श्री फ्रैंक एन्थनी साहब ने अपनी यह मंशा न जाहिर की होती कि हिन्दुस्तान की आफिशियल लैंग्वेज क्या होनी चाहिये और उस के सिलसिले में अंग्रेजी जबान को अधिक समय तक कास्टीन्यू किया जाना चाहिये, तो मैं यह समझता कि जो प्रस्ताव वह इस सदन के सामने लाये हैं, वह प्रस्ताव बहुत ही साफ़ तौर से लाये हैं कि जिस में एक माइनारिटी कम्युनिटी की लैंग्वेज को भाठवें शिड्युल में रखने की बात कही गई है। जहाँ तक इस कास्टीट्यूशन का सवाल है माइनारिटी कम्युनिटी के सिलसिले में, उन के राइट्स को पूरी तरह गारण्टी किया गया है, उन की लैंग्वेज को गारंटी किया गया है।

जहाँ तक अंग्रेजी का सवाल है, मैं इस बात को सदन में कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हिन्दी का सवाल नहीं है। कई क्वार्टरों से यह दिखाने की कोशिश होती है कि हिन्दी को साबने की कोशिश की जा रही है। मैं ने आज सुना कि सरकारी पार्टी के नेता नेहरू जी ने भी कहा कि मैं इस बात को पसन्द नहीं करूँगा कि हिन्दी को हिन्दुस्तान पर लादा जाय। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दी को किसी पर लादने का सवाल नहीं है। सवाल

यह है कि अंग्रेजी का हिन्दुस्तान की राज-भाषा के रूप में जल्द से जल्द खत्म होना चाहिये। आज प्रश्न इस बात का है कि हम अंग्रेजी को राजभाषा के रूप में चलाते जा रहे हैं। आज प्रश्न है अंग्रेजी का और अंग्रेजी के मुकाबले में हिन्दुस्तान की दूसरी लोक-भाषाओं का। आज प्रश्न है इस बात का कि इस देश में सामन्ती जबान चलेगी, या जनता को जबानें चलेंगी। आज प्रश्न इस बात का है कि हिन्दुस्तान की लोक-भाषाओं को प्रतीक करना है या अंग्रेजी भाषा को किसी न किसी शकल में चलाये जाना है। आज माननीय राजगोपालाचारी साहब और माननीय फ्रैंक एन्थनी साहब इस बात को कहते हैं कि देश में हिन्दी को आफिशियल लैंग्वेज बनाने के सिलसिले में बहुत ज्यादा विरोध है, इसलिये अंग्रेजी को आफिशियल लैंग्वेज के रूप में कायम रखा जाये। उसी के साथ साथ अंग्रेजी जबान के मामले में माननीय नेहरू जी ने बड़ी वकालत की। यह सही बात है कि उन्होंने बहुत तर्कसंगत तरीके से अंग्रेजी की वकालत की। इस में कोई शक नहीं है—इस में कोई दो रायें नहीं हो सकती हैं। लेकिन उन का भी यह कहना है कि अंग्रेजी को धीरे धीरे इस देश से हटाया जाना चाहिये। जब मैं ये सब बातें सुनता हूँ—उन सब आवाजों को सुनता हूँ, चाहे व इधर से आये और चाहे उधर से, तो मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि हमारे देश की सांस्कृतिक पृष्ठभूमि में जो आन्तरिक फूट है, वह स्पष्ट तौर से दिखाई पड़ती है। हमारी शिक्षायात राज-गोपालाचारी साहब या फ्रैंक एन्थनी साहब से उतनी नहीं है, जितनी कि सरकारी पार्टी के लोगों से है, जिन का संबिधान सभा में बहुमत था और जिनमें ने उस में इस बात को पास किया कि पंद्रह साल में हम इस बात की कोशिश करेंगे कि हिन्दी जबान को इस देश की राष्ट्रीय जबान के रूप में पूरी तरह से लायें। हम इस बात को देख रहे हैं कि इस सम्बन्ध में जितनी कोशिश होनी चाहिये थी, उतनी नहीं

हुई है। इस विषय में इस बात को ध्यान में रखना चाहिये। अभी नेहरू जी ने कहा कि हमारे सामने सार्वाधिक डेवलपमेंट का सवाल है, इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट का सवाल है और ऐसी हालत में फ़ारेन लैंग्वेज को किसी शकल में बनाये रखना जरूरी है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या रूस और दूसरे मुल्कों ने, जो कि इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट में आगे बढ़े हैं, जिन्होंने दूसरे मामलों में तरक्की की है, दूसरे देशों की ज़बान को अपना कर तरक्की की। सीधा सवाल यह है कि यदि किसी देश को उठाना है, बनाना है, तो उस के लिये हम को दिक्कत उठानी पड़ेगी, परेशानी उठानी पड़ेगी। यह सही है कि इस मामले में बहुत कुछ संशय होते हैं और होते रहेंगे, लेकिन जब हम को एक नया हिन्दुस्तान बनाना है, तो इस बात का ध्यान रखना पड़ेगा कि उस को बनाने के सिलसिले में जोखम और संशय उठाना पड़ेगा।

अन्त में श्रीमान, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि भाषा मानवीय सम्बन्धों को आपस में व्यक्त करने के सिलसिले में एक माध्यम है, भाषा बस्तु और भाव को व्यक्त करने के सिलसिले में एक माध्यम का काम करती है और ऐसी हालत में मातृभाषा में जो विषय-ज्ञान हो सकता है, मातृभाषा में जो ज्ञान-अर्जन हो सकता है, वह किसी दूसरी ज़बान में नहीं हो सकता है। अंग्रेजी भाषा को पढ़ने में छः सात साल लगाये जायें लेकिन जितना विषय ज्ञान हम छः सात सालों में अपनी मातृ-भाषा में कर सकते हैं, उतना अंग्रेजी में नहीं कर सकते हैं और वही छः सात साल अंग्रेजी भाषा के पढ़ने में लग जायेंगे। हम को यह ध्यान कर ताज्जुब हुआ कि माननीय नेहरू जी ने कहा कि सैकड़ों लैंग्वेज के रूप में अंग्रेजी को बनाये रखा जा सकता है। और हमें माने वाले बहुत समय तक के लिये बनाये रखना जा सकता है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं इतना स्पष्ट कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक अंग्रेजी का सवाल है, हम कोई अंग्रेजी के विरुद्ध नहीं, लेकिन अंग्रेजी

को विषय ज्ञान में के रूप में तो हम ले सकते हैं, अंग्रेजी को शासन की भाषा के रूप में, अंग्रेजी को रोजमर्रा के व्यवहार की भाषा के रूप में, रोजमर्रा के आपस के चलन की भाषा के रूप में हम इस देश ने किसी तरह के भी मानन के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। जहाँ तक अंग्रेजी को विषय ज्ञान के सिलसिले में लेने का सवाल है, अंग्रेजीको पढ़ने का सवाल है, इस में कोई दो राय नहीं हों सकती कि हम अंग्रेजी पढ़ने के लिये तैयार हैं। जो अंग्रेजी पढ़ना चाहेगा वह पढ़ेगा। इसी तरह जो दूसरी विशेष विदेशी भाषाये पढ़ना चाहेंगे, पढ़ेंगे।

मैं इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ आखिर मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आज यह अक्सर कहा जाता है कि हिन्दी जो है वह बहुत तरक्कीप्राप्त ज़बान नहीं है, लेकिन यदि अंग्रेजी ज़बान में दो या तीन लाख शब्द होंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान की लोक भाषाओं में छः या सात लाख शब्द होंगे। इसी सिलसिले में यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले कुछ दिनों में अंग्रेजी भले ही मज गई हो, लेकिन यदि हिन्दी को भौका मिला होता, जैसा कि अंग्रेजी को मिलता रहा है, तब वह भी काफी तरक्की कर लेती। जिस ज़बान के अन्दर ताकत होगी तो वह खुद अपना स्थान बना लेगी, लेकिन यदि इस के लिये प्रयत्न हुआ तो यह कार्य अल्दी होगा। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की भाषाये, चाहे वह हिन्दी हो या दूसरी लोक भाषाएँ हों, सभी अपना स्थान जरूर बना लेगी। लेकिन इस के साथ ही साथ संविधान की जो मशा है, उसे पूरा करने के लिये सरकारी पार्टी को जितना कुछ करना चाहिये था, वह नहीं कर रही है। इसलिये आज मैं यह कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि सरकारी पार्टी पर इस की जिम्मेदारी है। ज़बान के मामले में हमेशा यह ऐसी भाषणों को दे कर, ऐसी बातों को कह कर यह दिखाने की कोशिश करती है कि आज दक्षिण के लोग हिन्दी का विरोध करने के लिये तैयार हैं। लेकिन राज भाषा हिन्दी के रूप में

[बी व. ना. सिंह]

कई ऐसी बात नहीं है लेकिन फिर भी मैं तो उत्तर के लोगों से कहना चाहता हूँ, और उत्तर के लोग इस के लिये भी तैयार हो जायेंगे, कि दक्षिण के लोगों को जो भी सुविधा इस सम्बन्ध में देनी हो, वह हम उन के लिये दें। लेकिन हिन्दी को हिन्दुस्तानी की राजभाषा के रूप में पूरी तौर से लाने और तरक्की देने की कोशिश की जाय।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप। लेकिन वे सिर्फ पाच मिनट ले तो बड़ी मेहरबानी होगी। इस तरह से कम से कम तीन, चार मन्बर और बोल सकेंगे।

**Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura):** My most important point is that we should not discuss any subject by arousing passions on both sides, whether it be the question of a party or a question of language or a question of culture. Our ancient culture teaches us that we are all parts of one whole, but this modern culture makes us fight for parties, for religions, for provinces, for countries. This should go. That is my most important point. And I say if Mr. Anthony wants to have English language, I do not think there is any harm. I think we can also add Sindhi, Pushtu and Irani also. (*An Hon. Member: Why not Russian?*) I think there is no harm if some people want to have one more, two more or three more languages along with our fourteen languages.

**An Hon. Member:** Also Ceylonese.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap:** Sindhi, of course. I have said it.

If we consider that these gentlemen are Anglo-Indians and if they want their own language, then of course, if we accept that they are Anglo-Indians, then they must also have their own mother-tongue. (*An*

**Hon. Member:** They have it). It is very good that these gentlemen still remember their parents in England.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Member should be more discreet.

**Raja Mahendra Pratap:** It is our culture that we should respect our parents. So, if they respect their parents, it is very nice of them. We honour them, we respect them.

So far as this question of language is concerned, I think we should adopt the resolution of Mr. Anthony. It will also help us in other ways. For instance, in Punjab there is the question of Hindi and Punjabi. I think that question also can be solved thus that if you are speaking Hindi, speak Hindi; if you are speaking Punjabi, speak Punjabi. Where is the harm? What I mean to suggest is that all those people who have a certain language at home should be allowed to develop their language.

I may tell you in Soviet Russia there are 149 States, and most of these States are based on races and languages. I was travelling in Soviet Russia. For instance, here I go, they speak Tatars, there I go, they speak Turkmani, in another place they speak Uzbeki, in yet another place they speak Tajiki. They have their own States. I only mean to say that we should not arouse passions on this matter.

I received several letters from Hindi-speaking people and Hindi fanatics that I should not support Mr. Anthony on this question. Why should there be such a morbid mind on this simple question? We should help Mr. Anthony and accept his resolution. There is no harm in it. When we accept Hindi as our national language, and when Mr. Anthony accepts Hindi as our national language, where remains any quarrel about it? Hindi is the language of all India. This we accept.



One thing I will say in the end—what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru also has said—that is, what kind of Hindi there should be. When my hon. friend Shri Vajpayee was speaking yesterday, I said I might go and bring a Hindi dictionary to understand it. I could not follow many of his words. I mean to say that Hindi should be what Mahatma Gandhi said, that is Hindustani which we all understand. They say in our villages "Nikhali". That is an Arabic perverted word, if I speak pure Arabic, Sanskrit or Persian word they will not understand. That is what I mean. Buddha has shown us the way. Though at that time Sanskrit was prevalent, he spoke in Prakrit, the language of the people. Therefore I suggest that we have such a Hindi that all people will understand.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Aurangabad): At the fag end of the debate it is very difficult to cover all the points or even those points which are necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Moreover, there are only five minutes!

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: I want to touch only two points. I do not know how the question of citizenship can be related to a language. My esteemed friend Shri Nath Pai, while pleading for the inclusion of English and some other languages in the Eighth Schedule, stated that the Anglo-Indian community would feel more as citizens of this land if English is included in the Eighth Schedule, if I have understood him correctly. I think we should dispel all these ideas from our minds. The question of citizenship is quite different from that of language.

Secondly, let us remember once for all that English is not going to have that glamour, and that necessity also, in the future of India, in the pattern that we have built. I have received my education through the medium of English. I have learnt Sanskrit through the medium of

English. But, the generation that is coming up is not going to be instructed through English, but through its own mother tongue. Today or tomorrow, the English language will disappear except to the extent that we need it for scientific and technological purposes. Having that limited scope, whether it may be the language of the Anglo-Indian community or any other community is irrelevant to the issue which we are considering. Let us not bring in these sentimental, emotional, and extraneous considerations into this problem. I am not approaching it from the point of view of official language or national language. Unfortunately, Shri Frank Anthony, with whom I had to sit for months together in the Parliamentary Committee on Official language, had chosen a very bad time. Till our own thinking was tagged on to the official language question, he surreptitiously—people at least would feel that it is a surreptitious way of giving undue importance to the English language. He failed there and he wants to succeed here. The same cause which brought about his failure there is going to bring about his failure here, because the context is the same. It is inevitable.

The English language will survive in India and it should survive in India. I am all for that. I feel that it is a language which most of us should learn out of our own voluntary like, not as an imposed one. I would only plead with him that, having heard the Prime Minister, let him not press it for a Division. He will be doing a disservice to the cause which he wants to serve to his community, unnecessarily putting his own community with some bitterness in the minds of his countrymen, because, he is speaking on behalf of the Anglo-Indian community as he says now, or at least as some of the supporters of the Resolution have put it. If this comes on behalf of a particular community, in all humility, I would like to say that it is a bad omen for that community. Let us not go in for that. I would plead with him not to press it to a division.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र (बेजू सराय): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री हमारे सामने प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने जो विवेकपूर्ण और विद्वत्ता से भरा हुआ भाषण दिया उस के बाद मैं समझता हूँ कि कुछ कहने की जरूरत नहीं थी और हमारे स्वामी रामानन्द तीर्थ ने श्री एन्थनी से जो अपना श्रंग्रेजी वाला प्रस्ताव वापिस लेने का अनुरोध किया है, मैं माशा करता हूँ कि वह प्रस्ताव वापिस ल लिया जायेगा . . . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य . वे उस को वापिस नहीं लेंगे ।

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र . उनको वापिस ले लेना चाहिये । मैं भी श्री फ्रेंक एन्थनी से अपील करूँगा कि वे अपना प्रस्ताव वापिस ले लें ।

भाषा जोड़ने वाली चीज भी होती है और भाषा दुनिया की, समाज को और देश को और लोगों की बाटने वाली चीज भी होती है । भाषा लोगों को जोड़ सकती है, बनाती है और उन को तोड़ती भी है और मारती भी है । भाषा दुधारी तलवार की मानिन्द है जिसमें कि दो धारे होती हैं । योरूप के लोग सब तरह से एक हैं लेकिन उन की भाषा एक न होने का परिणाम यह है कि वे अलग-अलग बटे हुए हैं और हर बीस साल बाद वही से एक महायुद्ध घाता है । इसलिये भाषा के सवाल पर हम को बहुत गम्भीरता से और भावनाओं को हटा कर सोचना चाहिये । जिस तरह से श्री एन्थनी यह प्रस्ताव सदन के समक्ष लाये हैं मैं समझता हूँ कि वह बिना सोचे समझे और बिना विवेक के यह प्रस्ताव लाये हैं । अगर उनको प्रस्ताव लाना ही था तो उन सब से श्रंग्रेजी के अलावा अन्य और बहुत सी बड़ी बड़ी भाषायें जो इस देश में हैं उनसे विचार विमर्श करके और एक कमेटी बनाते और राय करके कोई एक प्रस्ताव माते तो बात भी थी ।

सबसे बड़ी बात तो यह है कि संसद की भाषाई समिति के वे एक सदस्य वे और जिस ने कि कई बैठकें करने के बाद अपनी रिपोर्ट सदन को पेश की है लेकिन उस की बैठकों में श्री एन्थनी ने इस तरीके की कोई बात नहीं उठाई लेकिन एक प्रस्ताव यहाँ पर ले आये जिस पर मेरी राय में विचार करना ही देश में शगड़े पैदा करना है ।

मेरे मित्र श्री नाथ पाई ने बहुत ही भावना-पूर्ण भाषण किया और उस छोटी सी ऐंग्लो इंडियन जाति की वकालत करते हुए कहा कि उस को रक्षा करने के लिये उस की भाषा को कबूल किया जाय । मेरा ख्याल है कि उनके इस तरह के भाषण की कोई जरूरत नहीं थी । प्रजा संश्लिस्ट नेता को श्रंग्रेजी भाषा की वकालत करते हुए थोड़े विवेक से काम लेना चाहिये था और यह ध्यान में रखना चाहिये था कि इस देश में संविधान में शैड्यूल्ड में जो १४ भाषायें लिखी गई हैं उनके अलावा और भी अनेक भाषायें इस देश में बोली जाती हैं । हमारे द्वाइं करोड़ आदिवासी भाइयों की कई भाषायें हैं, और उन में सवाल भाषा भी है जो बहुत समृद्ध भाषा है । इसी तरह भोजपुरी की करीब ५ करोड़ लोग बोलते हैं । इन सब भाषाओं को नजर अन्दाज कर के एक लाल या एक लाल से भी कम ऐंग्लो इंडियनों द्वारा अपनाई गई श्रंग्रेजी भाषा के लिये उनका वकालत करना कुछ समझ में नहीं आया । वे जो ऐंग्लो इंडियनों को रक्षण देने के लिये कह रहे हैं तो मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर उन को मार ही कौन रहा है ? संविधान में जो बुनियादी अधिकार सम्बन्धी २९(ए) धारा है उस फडामेंटल राइट्स वाली धारा में यह दिया हुआ है कि छोटी से छोटी जाति जो कि अपनी एक अलग भाषा, लिपि व संस्कृति रखती है, उस को अधिकार है कि वह अपनी लिपि, भाषा और संस्कृति की हिफाजत करे और उस को बनाये रखे और सरकार का, शासन का यह कर्तव्य है, धारित्व है, कि वह

उसकी हिफाजत करने में उस की मदद करे । कोई भी भाषा बाले लोग अपना स्कूल चला सकते हैं और विभिन्न भाषाओं के स्कूल इस देश में चल भी रहे हैं । इस देश में किसी भी भाषा को दबाया नहीं जाता है । हर एक भाषा को बढ़ने और फलने फूलने के लिये प्रोत्साहन दिया जाता है तब में नहीं समझता कि अंग्रेजी के लिये श्री एन्थनी इतने चिन्तित क्यों हैं ? अंग्रेजी को श्री एन्थनी आदि की बकालत की जरूरत नहीं है । अंग्रेजी स्वयं अपने बल से, एन्थनी सहब के बल से नहीं, इस देश में कायम रहेगी और लोग उस को किसी भी रूप में पढते रहेंगे । अंग्रेजी कोई एक लाख एंग्लो इंडियनों के सहारे ही यहा पर नहीं चलेगी बल्कि उम में तो इतने गुण है और इतना विशाल साहित्य है कि लोग उस को स्वयं पढेंगे ।

में मानता हूँ कि अंग्रेजी बोलने वाली एक विदेशी कौम ने हमारे देश के ऊपर १०० वर्ष से अधिक राज्य किया और हम को गुलाम बनाये रक्खा लेकिन उस के साथ ही यह भी मानता हूँ कि इस अंग्रेजी भाषा ने हमारे स्वाधीन होने और आजाद होने में बहुत मदद की । अंग्रेजी भाषा के लिये मेरे मन में बहुत आदर है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह भाषा इतनी बलवान है, समृद्ध है और इतनी सुन्दर है कि उस को श्री एन्थनी के प्रस्ताव की और मेरे मित्र श्री नाथ पार्स के भावुकतापूर्ण भाषण की जरूरत नहीं है : उन से उस को मदद नहीं मिलने वाली है । अंग्रेजी भाषा तो आज भी हमारे देश में पूरी तरह छाई हुई है और आज भी देश की छाती पर विद्यमान है और कई तरह से वह भारतीय भाषाओं को दबाती है और उन को अपने नीचे रखती है उस हद तक वह देश का नुकसान ही कर रही है । लेकिन जैसा कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने अपने भाषण में संकेत किया जिस हद तक वह विश्व के दरवाजे खोलती है और खिड़किया खोलने का काम करती है, हम उस का स्वागत करते हैं और उस हद तक हम अंग्रेजी को अपने देश में

रखना चाहते हैं । मैं श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के इस कथन के सहमत हूँ कि अगर हम ने अंग्रेजी को इस देश से निकाल दिया तो हिन्दुस्तान स्वयं अपना बड़ा अहित करेगा लेकिन तथ्य यह है कि अंग्रेजी इस देश से निकाली नहीं जा रही है ।

श्री एन्थनी जो यह प्रस्ताव लाये है उस में उन्होंने हिन्दी के लिये जो उन के मन में द्वेष है और जहर है, उस को इस में प्रकट कर दिया है । उन्होंने ससदीय भाषा समिति की रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में जो नोट दिया है उस में उन्होंने अपने को बिल्कुल प्रकट कर दिया है और हिन्दुस्तान की भाषाओं के खिलाफ और खास कर राज भाषा हिन्दी के खिलाफ जो उन के दिल में एक द्वेष है और जहर भरा हुआ है उस का पूरा आभास उस नोट में मिल जाता है ।

अंग्रेजी को हमारे संविधान में सुरक्षा पाने के सभी अधिकार मिले हुए हैं, भले ही वह एक अल्पमत की और छोटे से गिरोह की भाषा ही सही । संविधान में भाषा की सुरक्षण देने के लिये उचित व्यवस्था कर दी गई है कि कैसे किसी अल्पमत की भाषा को सुरक्षण दिया जाये, उस को बरकरार रक्खा जाय, उस के लिये इस ससद द्वारा एक समुचित कानून भी प्राप्त हो चुका है : और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस के लिये इस प्रस्ताव को लाने की कोई जरूरत नहीं थी । लेकिन एक बात है जिस पर हम को और आप को सोचना चाहिये कि यह प्रस्ताव जब आयेगा तो उस के बाद और-और प्रस्ताव आयेगे, झगड़े होंगे, अंग्रेजी बनाम भारतीय भाषाओं के झगड़े और इस झगड़े को बढ़ा कर अंग्रेजी के नाम पर इस देश का उपकार नहीं बल्कि नुकसान होगा और जो बीज इस देश का नुकसान करती है वह देश की एक छोटी सी जाति एंग्लो इंडियनों का भी नुकसान करेगी । इसलिये मैं एक मित्र के नाते श्री एन्थनी से और उन के मित्र बैरो साहब से निवेदन करूंगा कि इस प्रस्ताव की वापस ले लें, इस पर बहुत बहुत हो चुकी है ।

in the Eighth Schedule  
of the Constitution

**Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians):** I am deeply grateful for the intervention of the Prime Minister. Before I make a further reference to some of the observations that fell from the Leader of the House, may I seek to, shall I say, repel some of the imputations that have been made against me in the bringing of this motion?

My hon friend who spoke just before me has suggested that my motion was inspired by some kind of anti-Hindi animus, and that this animus or this allegation finds fortification in my Minute of Dissent as a Member of the Parliamentary Language Committee. May I reassure him that his whole process of reasoning is, at any rate, inverted, if not perverted? I have never been an antagonist of Hindi. Every morning I read my Hindi, or I should say my Hindustani, dictionary in the Devanagiri script for half an hour. The only or the primary reason why I brought this resolution was the reason of fear, and I am glad to say that that fear has been largely assuaged by the intervention of the Prime Minister.

From a narrow point of view I saw this hatred motivation against English mounting in the country. I know that the fact that English happens to be my mother tongue and the mother tongue of a microscopic minority in the larger Indian context may not be important, but, at any rate, I had the right to resist what I felt was a campaign, a hate-motivated campaign, with the sole objective of destroying English. And may I say to my hon friend, Shri Mishra from UP . . .

Some Hon. Members: From Bihar

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I beg your pardon, from Bihar—that I assess this campaign and its motives not by professions. Many of my friends from the Hindi States have professed not only respect, they have professed love for the English language, but more and more I have seen exhibitions from which I and other people have drawn

our own conclusions. They were inevitable, inescapable conclusions. What conclusion do you expect me to draw from the *angrez hatav* movement of U.P.?

**Shri M. P. Mishra:** That movement is not confined to U.P. That is indulged in by a party known as the Socialist Party of Dr Lohia, an all-India party.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** That is the only correct movement for the masses of India if they have to progress.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** What conclusion do you expect me to draw from the fact that ostensibly educated legislators in U.P. walk out as an act of deliberate discourtesy against their Governor because he chose to speak in what to them was a foreign language?

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** No, it was not that. No discourtesy was meant.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** That House is strong enough to protect itself.

**Mr Deputy-Speaker:** He can refer to that.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** It is from these acts that I draw this conclusion, and I have seen it in this House. Why is it that this resolution has been not only opposed but opposed bitterly, not only opposed bitterly but opposed venomously, only by those whose mother tongue is Hindi? Why?

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** That is wrong.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** It was opposed by Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Because, those whose mother tongue is Hindi have persuaded themselves—you may not accept my inference—that until they destroy English, Hindi can never become the official language of this country.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

1321 Resolutions re: BRAVANA 16, 1881 (SARA) Inclusion of English 1322  
in the Eighth Schedule  
of the Constitution

**Shri Harish Chandra Mather (Pali):** Disabuse your mind of this impression.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** It is because of this Hindi-motivated hatred for English that I brought this resolution.

**Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh):** I think Shri Mishra was right in attributing that motive to you, since you are attributing this motive to others.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Do not withdraw it and oblige any one.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I am glad my hon. friends from the Hindi States are now disclaiming any hatred for English, and I hope in future their policies in the Hindi States will square more with these professions of alleged respect for the English language.

I was grateful to my friend Shri Nath Pai for the attitude he took up. He pleaded that if Government was honest in its professions towards the Anglo-Indian community, whose recognised mother tongue is English, then they must accept English as one of the languages of India. And he made the plea that I should not press my resolution because he said that while it was acceptable, it should be brought in along with other languages and at that time we could consider the claims of these different languages for inclusion in the Eighth Schedule.

I just want to make a comment in passing in reply to an observation that fell from Shri Nath Pai. He said: although we remember the batons of the Anglo-Indian policemen, the culture of India, the catholicity of India, does not choose to remember the past. I am grateful for that, but I would remind him that it was not only the batons of the Anglo-Indian sergeants of police. We were the products of a certain matrix—historical, cultural, social. We might have done our duty wrongly from your point of view, but we were not the only Indians who used batons. There were a lot of other Indians in the police forces who did it, and we did our duty rightly or wrongly according to our point of

view. But let me say of this criticism that the Anglo-Indian community has yet to identify itself with the country, that is not quite correct. As Indians, we are all schizophrenics. We are schizophrenics because that is part of the compulsion of history. We are schizophrenics in that we seek to reconcile the *charkha* with the Bhakra dam, we seek to reconcile the bullock cart with the jet plane. We are schizophrenics in that way.

I am a product of east and west. My thoughts and my way of life are more western than eastern, and yet India clings to me as she does to all her children in innumerable ways. That, you may say, expresses the feeling of the Anglo-Indian, and yet those are the words of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru about himself.

And after all, this claim of patriotism and loyalty is not the monopoly of any community. May I remind Shri Nath Pai that perhaps more injury was done to the Anglo-Indian community by British rule and by Britain than to any other community of India? He does not know this. I am completing my history of the community.

Until 1806 we were the soldiers of India, we were the merchant princes of India, and in 1806 because they were afraid that the Anglo-Indians might join with the other Indians of this country to drive them out, an embargo was placed on my community. After 1806 no Anglo-Indian could get into the covenanted service. All Anglo-Indians holding commissions were driven out. No Anglo-Indian could hold land or property in this country. You do not know our history, I do. You know the more recent manifestations of that history, but that has not been our history entirely.

The first national bard of modern India was an Anglo-Indian, De Rozio. He was one of that band with the help of which Ram Mohan Roy was responsible for the intellectual awakening, the cultural renaissance which

[Shri Frank Anthony]

came to India with the English language. De Rozio has been acclaimed rightly not only as Bangala's poet, but as the first national bard of modern India, and it was the efforts of de Rozio, his 'Apostrophe to Freedom', his sonnets, his odes to India that were primarily responsible for firing the imagination and the minds of the youth of Bengal with the inspiration of liberty. I say that in passing.

I want to come back to the subject and meet only some of the fallacies which have been perpetrated; and one of them is. What was the main motive of my resolution? I wanted to remove this taint of foreignness. And I am grateful to the Prime Minister that he accepted this position. He said, yes, we recognise the fact that the mother-tongue of the Anglo-Indian community is English, that they must get every facility for retaining that mother-tongue, we should recognise the need of our giving them facilities for their schools. This was one of my main motives, because I was afraid—my hon. friend does not know, but I know, because I am dealing with this problem every day, the tremendous pressures that I am facing in some of the Hindi States, because—I say, and I say it with great regret—of this basic motive of hatred against English; there are some people who are avowedly committed to the policy of destroying English, and they feel they can only destroy English if they destroy my schools, because they feel that my schools are the nerve-centres of English teaching, and that until these schools are destroyed, they will never be able to destroy English.

Seth Govind Das (Jabalpur): I object to it.

Shri Frank Anthony: It was only a motive of fear. . . .

सेठ गोविन्द दास : उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं बीच में आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य की हिन्दी और दूसरी

भारतीय भाषाओं के प्रति जो भावनाएँ हैं, उस के कारण वह यह कह रहे हैं कि हम लोग अंग्रेजी से बचना करते हैं। हम में से किसी को अंग्रेजी से बचना नहीं है। लेकिन माननीय सदस्य ने संसद् की राजभाषा समिति की रिपोर्ट में जो कुछ लिखा है, उस से मालूम होता है कि उन को हिन्दी और दूसरी भारतीय भाषाओं से कितनी बृणा है।

Shri Frank Anthony: My hon. friend is not reading from cause to effect. He is reading from effect to cause. My attitude in the Parliamentary Committee on Official Language was an attitude which had crystallised after a long period of ten years. I had explained the process by which I had reached that ultimate position of crystallisation. I had supported the fact that Hindustani should become. . . .

सेठ गोविन्द दास : शुरू से यह राय रही है।

Shri Frank Anthony: . . . the official language of this country.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : मैं जवलपुर से आता हूँ। मैं माननीय सदस्य की राय जानता हूँ।

Shri Frank Anthony: Let me make it very clear that at that time I had expressed my doubts to no less a person than Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. I said, we should not use the word 'Hindi', but we should use the word 'Hindustani', because Gandhiji with his unerring instinct knew that if we were going to have a language which could be not the national but the official language, a language which would hold the scales evenly between all the peoples who constitute this ethnographical museum in this country it had to be a neutral language.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Hissar): There is no difference between Hindi and Hindustani actually.

Seth Govind Das: Satan is quoting Scriptures.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** It is not a neutral language.

I have said that I am prepared to accept here and now Hindustani as the official language. I want a language that is neutral. I want a language with which no one identifies his religion; I want a language with which no one identifies a particular community; I want a language with which no one identifies the oppression of any linguistic minority; I want a language with which no one identifies the oppression of the language of any Linguistic minority. Had we had Hindustani, we would never have got all these manifestations which today have created a revulsion not only in my mind. Ask the Muslims what they feel; ask the Sikhs what they feel. (Interruptions.) This revulsion has come because you have traded in hate.

**सेठ गोबिन्द दास :** उपाध्यक्ष जी, यह झगड़ा हिन्दुस्तानी और हिन्दी का नहीं है, अंग्रेजी और हिन्दी और भारतीय भाषाओं का है।

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I say this to my friends as the Prime Minister has said but said it perhaps more euphemistically that you cannot impose your language on any other peoples.

**सेठ गोबिन्द दास :** कोई इम्पोज नहीं करना चाहता है।

**Shri Frank Anthony:** It is this imposition motive, it is this hatred motive that has created this revulsion against Hindi.

**पंडित ब्रज नारायण "ब्रजेश" (शिवापुरी):**  
सिख बिल्कुल हिन्दी के विरुद्ध नहीं लड़ रहे हैं।

**Shri Frank Anthony:** No; hatred will beget hatred. (Interruptions).

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** This is too much.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I am a very small person; I cannot create any revulsion against Hindi. Why is there this revulsion against Hindi in this country?

**Seth Govind Das:** There is no revulsion.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** If you say, there is no revulsion, if you say that the people in the south want Hindi, if you say that all the Sikhs want Hindi, if you say that...

**Seth Govind Das:** Have voting on your resolution, and you will find what the position is. (Interruptions).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shall we be able to go on like this?

क्या अब कार्यवाही बन्द करे ?

**श्री ब्रज राज सिंह :** नहीं, चलने दीजिये।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** चलने दे, तो चलेगी।  
उन को जवाब तो देने दीजिये। जो वह महसूस करते हैं, उन को कहने दीजिये।

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara):** This is not a controversy between Hindi and English.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** It is not, but in spite of that it was sought to be made so in this country.

There is one thing in regard to which Shri Nath Pai has intervened, and which has jogged my memory. And I think it is good that I should say something with regard to the observations that fell from his lips. I want to reassure him that let him not feel that this community that I have the privilege of representing is not identifying itself with India. As I say, there is schizophrenia; there is schizophrenia among some Hindus. That is a part, as I say, of the fact that they have emerged from some kind of social, cultural and educational matrix. But let me remind you that I am a microscopic minority, and I am making my contribution to India....

**An Hon. Member:** Let him address the Chair.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** ...according to my innate capacity for loyalty. Perhaps, Shri Nath Pai does not know that the history of Kashmir might well have been differently written but for the Anglo-Indian pilot I am writing. . .

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** You are one of them

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I am glad of that I want you to realise

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** My hon friend should speak what is relevant so far as the resolution is concerned He is only beating his own drum and saying that he has done this and done that, or that his community has done this or that Are we discussing the resolution or are we discussing the Anglo-Indian community here? It is not fair to speak of these things on this resolution

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** We are proud of every Anglo-Indian

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Hissar):** But we want to hear about the resolution I want that the hon Member should speak what is relevant to the resolution and not waste the time of the House

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I was only answering the criticism that let the Anglo-Indians serve India We are serving it and we are dying for it

**Mr Deputy-Speaker:** If the hon Member addresses the Chair, perhaps, he might have less difficulty

**Shri Frank Anthony.** I want to repel one or two other fallacies One fell from Shri H N Mukerjee My hon. friend Shri Nath Pai said that he was considerably impressed by Shri H N Mukerjee's argument, and I was not ... Shri H N Mukerjee is a great personal friend of mine. But Shri H. N. Mukerjee in his usual,

rather fevered way and with his normal sort of verbal-cum-historic hyperbole talked—unfortunately, he is not here today....

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat)** He is ill

**Shri Frank Anthony:** But that does not take away my respect for him I was only criticising his sentiment He felt sorry for people who live in this kind of twilight world, with a sort of hybridised culture I was sorry for Shri H N Mukerjee when I saw this picture of self-pity that he had drawn. He said that English had meant cultural enslavement of this country. I know something of this subject And may I say with great respect that Shri H N Mukerjee when he spoke in this way was not in the best Bengali tradition? For, what is the Bengali tradition? The Bengali tradition is a tradition of cultural democracy, the Bengal tradition is a tradition of a synthesis of cultures, that is not a hybridised culture That is the apogee of culture, the ultimate expression of the highest form of culture, when you get a synthesis of cultures And that is the tradition of Bengal and for anyone to talk of the cultural enslavement of India by the bringing of English is to talk without a knowledge of what happened How did English inform the education of this country? It informed Indian education at the demand of Liberals led by Ram Mohan Roy Ram Mohan Roy refused to allow India to have, according to him, this pall of ignorance drawn over it by the perpetuation of Indian education It was as a result of the insistence of Ram Mohan Roy and his fellow-Bengali Liberals that English was brought to this country A great gift of history And what happened?

16.50 hrs.

[MR SPEAKER in the Chair]

As a result of Ram Mohan Roy's triumph, India rushed forward to an intellectual awakening; India rushed



forward to a cultural renaissance through and by English brought in at the instance of Ram Mohan Roy. India jumped from medievalism into the modern world.

That is why I repel this thesis that English led to the cultural enslavement of India. English led to an intellectual awakening in India. English led to a cultural renaissance in India. Tilak, one of your greatest patriots, proud of his own language, said....

An Hon. Member: Say 'Our' (*Interruptions*).

Shri Frank Anthony: Yes 'Our' (*Interruptions*).

श्री सीताधर जोशी (शाजापुर)  
जहा इंग्लिश नही है, और वह देश तरक्की करना चाहते थे, जैसे कि रशिया है, क्या वहा साइम आदि की तरक्की नही हुई ?

Shri Frank Anthony: As I was saying, the greatest Indians have recognised the place of English. I was quoting Tilak. He said that India, through English, received not only the inspiration for liberty, but through English it received the inspiration for patriotism. According to Tilak, there was no Indian patriotism till India was informed with the leaven of English literature and English thinking. Do not let us, in this spite and hatred for English, blame English for everything.

And after all, what have the greatest modern Indians done? The great thinkers, the writers, the creative artists—what have they done? They have interpreted themselves. From Ram Mohan Roy, Aurobindo Ghosh, Jawaharlal Nehru, Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, C. V. Raman—a whole host of them. What have they done? They have interpreted themselves. More than that, they have interpreted the spirit, the ethos, of India to the outside world through English. India would have been unknown to the extent that it is known today but for

these great creative artists who have interpreted India to the outside world.

And what has English done? It has brought to this country the broad impulses, the impetus, of freedom, of liberty, all the progress in every field of human thought and endeavour.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Frank Anthony: Let us not at least be churlish in this matter. As I say, I wanted to allay a certain illusion. Even Rabindranath Tagore—he was never challenged—said he received his great inspiration after reading Shelley and Keats. (*Interruption*).

As regards foreign-ness, may I say just one word? I do not understand it. I have shown that legally and factually, English is as much a language of this country as any of the other languages of this country.

Seth Govind Das: No.

Shri Frank Anthony: My hon. friend still says 'No'. If English is foreign, it may be foreign in its origin. But then it is no more foreign than Sanskrit. Its foreign-ness is relative, that there has been only 200 years acclimatization whereas the acclimatization of Sanskrit has been for 2,000 or 3,000 years. And then if you carry this argument of foreign-ness to its logical conclusion, where do we land? Then as a nation, we live, we move, we have our being in everything foreign. What we are doing here is foreign. Parliamentary democracy is foreign; our administration or administrative pattern is foreign (*Interruptions*). Our jurisprudence is foreign; our legal system is foreign. Everything we do is, I say, foreign (*Interruptions*). I am pleading for English and I am pleading for it in a right way. English has become a part of the warp and woof, of Indian life and of Indian thought. Let us ask ourselves this question: what is the life-line of Indian unity? What is the answer? English.

**An Hon. Member: Culture.**

**Shri Frank Anthony:** With all respect, in spite of this unity of culture, the history of India before the last 200 years was a history of tribalisms.

**Several Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** The unity of India was brought about only in the last 150 years (*Interruptions*). I know my history as well as anybody else.

**Seth Govind Das:** He has forgotten it altogether.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** All the facets of Indian history today, of Indian unity today, political, administrative, judicial and, most important of all, intellectual, owe their inspiration to English. What is the mortar of intellectual unity in this country? English. What is the mortar of emotional integration in this country? It is English. Then shall we end this life-line of unity, because of emotions of passion and hatred.....

**Shri C. E. Pattabhi Raman (Kumbakonam):** I would beg of my hon. friend not to over-argue his case.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I am coming to the end of my peroration.

I wish to thank the Prime Minister; he has more than accepted what I wanted. He has assured me with regard to my own language and to the needs of Anglo-Indian schools. He has inveighed against the attitude of the Hindi enthusiasts. He has said that this question of Hindi must be decided not by the Hindi-speaking people, but by the non-Hindi-speaking people.

Shri Nath Pai has also said that he is entirely in favour of my Resolution but that it must come up along with certain other languages. The Prime Minister has made it categorical. He has said that he sees no objection to English being in the Eighth Schedule.

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Seth Govind Das:** He never said that.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** All that he said is that if I force the issue at this particular time, it might create unnecessary friction. Because of that, I ask for leave of the House to withdraw my Resolution.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : अध्यक्ष जी, मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव के ऊपर वोटिंग हो जाये, यह विधड़ा न किया जाय क्योंकि बार बार यह सवाल उठेगा। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस समय इस पर वोट के लिया जाये और हाउस इस बात की इजाजत न दे कि इन के मूवर इस को वापस ले लें।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : विधड़ा होना चाहिये। नो वोटिंग।

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. With the motion for withdrawal, all excitement must subside.

There is an amendment in the name of Shri Surendranath Dwivedy. Is he pressing it?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** In view of the fact that the hon. Mover has asked for leave to withdraw the Resolution, I do not press my amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

*The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.*

**Mr. Speaker:** Has the hon. Mover the leave of the House to withdraw his Resolution?

*The Resolution was, by leave withdrawn.*