

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, this matter you have to find out because for the first time, an official, solemn address on the Independence Day has been used for pure and simple party propaganda in some respects. I am not saying that everything that the Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai, said is wrong. For example, his statement on the Kanjhwala issue was quite right. But, Sir, can you cite one example of a speech of the Prime Minister from the ramparts of the Red Fort on Independence Day when parties have been talked about in this manner?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, you cannot have a discussion on this, hon. Member.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, my friend, Mr. Advani, should take it seriously. It is gross misuse of power and authority, a fit case to go to the Shah Commission.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Discussion on the Education Policy of the Government of India, Mr. Bipinpal Das.

श्री सुलतान सिंह (हरियाणा) : डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, मुझे केवल इतना ही अर्ज करना है कि उस रोज सरकार का जो पैसा खर्च हुआ है वह जनता पार्टी को देना चाहिए क्योंकि उस पैसे का प्रयोग जनता पार्टी के लिए किया गया है ।

श्री उपसभापति : आप अपना स्थान ग्रहण कीजिये ।

श्री सुलतान सिंह : श्रीमन्, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस रोज जो पैसा सरकार ने खर्च किया उसका प्रयोग जनता पार्टी के प्रचार के लिए हुआ है ।

DISCUSSION ON THE EDUCATION POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I gave notice to raise a discussion on the Education Policy of the Government of India. As I am not feeling well, I would request you to allow Dr. Rafiq Zakaria, a member of my party, to initiate the discussion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Dr. Zakaria.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are discussing the educational policy of the present Government. However much they may like to claim that...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : What happened to Special Mentions? I took permission from the Chairman for Special Mentions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We had finished the Special Mentions before lunch.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir, you have not finished Special Mentions...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member spoke at that time...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here is the permission given by the Chairman...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When he was called, what was the honourable Member speaking about at that time?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It was not Special Mention ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I had called for Special Mentions and you spoke.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But then you did not call me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I called you and you spoke. Perhaps you spoke on something else.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I went to the Chairman for permission for two Special Mentions: one with regard to the procedure of the House, and another ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then would you like to interrupt the discussion and speak on your Special Mentions?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not know. But then, you allow me tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, we will see tomorrow.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not know what is happening.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are discussing the educational policy of the present Government. However much this Government might like to undo what might have been done in the past thirty years—because, that seems to be their swan-song—in the educational field as in the various other fields, they have inherited a legacy which, while there might have been some mistakes and even some blunders, has many glorious achievements to its credit. I have no intention of going into the history or the background of our educational system. For that purpose I will have to go back to centuries since the time of the minute of Lord Macaulay. But what we were anxious at the time of independence was that the impact of our new-born and newly-won freedom should be so translated in the transformation of the generations that are to follow, that they would be able to enjoy the fruits of this tremendous achievement on the part of our people. It was not an easy task. The first Education Minister, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, struggled hard; he went about it cautiously because he knew that the educational system has to be by its nature delicate operation. One couldn't do violence to it lest the whole super-structure should collapse. Therefore,

various committees were appointed to go into the question of not only modernising our educational system but also bringing it in tune with the hopes and aspirations of our people. This struggle went on year after year. There was the cry at that time of replacing English immediately by Hindi. Some effort in that direction was made, an effort which was misunderstood by the South. But it must be said to the credit of our first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, that with the sagacity, with the tact, with the understanding, that he possessed, he tackled this problem wisely, carefully and in a manner that for almost two decades the changes that were brought about, were brought about in a manner which did not create the kind of nervousness among the people which they are experiencing today. When Mr. Chagla, who is one of the founding fathers of the Janata Party became the Education Minister, he applied his mind to the mess that the whole process had created. He appointed one of the finest Commissions that have been appointed in this country, namely, the Kothari Commission. The Kothari Commission went deep into all aspects of our educational system and came out, after almost three years of sustained hard work and understanding all the implications of the various changes that were sought to be brought about, with its recommendations. I have no intention again of going into those recommendations because the House is well aware of them and it has also discussed those recommendations. From out of those recommendations certain healthy features which changed the pattern of our education came about. One of them with which we are experimenting at present, is the 10 plus 2 plus 3 system.

But before I come to that, I would like also to point out the significance of the three language formula because, as you know, we are a multi-lingual society. We are a multi-lingual state while the urge was there to regiona-

[Dr. Rafiq Zakaria]

lise education and make the mother tongue the medium of instruction at the primary and secondary stages, Pandit Nehru realised that the minorities, as a result of this regionalised education, were undergoing certain legitimate difficulties. In order to meet that situation, the three language formula was adopted. Under the three language formula, as you know, the regional language or the mother tongue, a modern language and a foreign language were to be taught and the States were called upon to implement this formula. But many of the States tried to implement this formula in their own way with the result that greater misunderstanding was created. The whole cry from the South of Hindi imposition is because of the fact that we have not approached our educational system in that objective, rational and integrated manner in which we should have. Had we been more circumspect, we would have seen to it that the students in the North did not suffer from the lack of English education from which they are suffering. And despite all that the Hindi enthusiasts have done the domination of English continues as before. The South also would not have been so allergic to the learning of Hindi with the result that instead of integration we have again a division between the North and the South which is almost frightening. Therefore, when we are discussing the educational policy, what is important is faithful adherence to the three language formula. This is the basic requisite if we have to succeed in that direction.

What is happening, for instance, in Uttar Pradesh? For mother tongue the students there have to take Hindi. And, Sir, I have nothing against Hindi. I believe that in the North, if the students have to fight the battle in the economic field, there is no escape from learning Hindi. But what is happening is that in the name of Hindi, Urdu, which is the mother-tongue of a large section of the people, is being elimi-

nated. What was expected was that under "modern languages", Urdu would get a place. But, Sir, you would be surprised to note that Sanskrit has been brought in by an ingenious device. Instead of having a modern language, out of the languages as enshrined in our Constitution, in the relevant Schedule of our Constitution—I do not know which Schedule it is—Sanskrit has been brought in with the result that Sanskrit becomes one of the languages under the three-language formula and it becomes a modern language under the three-language formula and, for the foreign language, English has been selected. Why are we fighting shy of the realities of the situation? Why are we not taking into consideration the fact that if we are really committed not only to a democratic set-up, but also to a secular set-up, then the satisfaction of not only the linguistic minorities, but also of the religious minorities, is very necessary, in fact absolutely necessary? Why is it that there is a feeling in the South that Hindi is being imposed? In that process, Sir, as I said, a tremendous damage is also being done in the North so much so that the students who are coming out from the universities in the North, whether they are taking up medical education or whether they are having engineering education or whether they are having any other technological subjects, they have necessarily to be taught in English, but they are all half-baked products. I was in West Germany, Sir, the other day and I was told that some of our doctors who came there for training and who had got first classes in some of the North Indian universities, were not able to follow even the rudimentary things in the medical field. This is what we have done to our students. Therefore, as I have said earlier, this has come about not because Hindi should not be taught, not because English has to be somehow or the other placated but because of the fact that the sort of understanding that was to be brought to bear on education, on

matters concerning education, was lacking. I am sure, Sir, that with a proper understanding, the three-language formula could have been worked in such a way that our students would have become genuinely multi-lingual students, who would have become proficient in Hindi, as well as in their respective mother-tongues and also in English. But we are neither here nor there now and, in this process, what has happened to the textbooks that we have prepared, is tragic. Some of the excellent textbooks that we have prepared have been withdrawn. Why? Because they said that some of those who prepared those textbooks were the favourites of the Congresswallahs. Now, tomorrow, when another party comes into power, the other textbooks would be withdrawn because some of them would be accused of being the favourites of the Janata Partywallahs! Is this the way we are going to give education to our younger generation, to our children, to those people who are going to secure the future of this country? And, Sir, what are those textbooks which are being replaced? Sir, I am reminded of a couplet by the great Urdu poet, Akbar Allahabadi:

“हम ऐसी सब कितने कबिले ज़री समझते हैं,
क जिनको पढ़ के बेटे बाप को खपनी समझते हैं”।

This is what is happening now. Even the students, who are learning what we are prescribing to them, laugh at us. They say that we do not know what we are giving them. Instead of being grateful to us for giving them what we think are in their interest, they laugh at us. Their reaction is exactly the opposite. The same is the situation as far as the 10+2+3 formula is concerned. I am not blaming the Education Minister for this formula because this is a legacy which he has inherited. Let me tell you that the formula is not bad at all.

It is an excellent formula. But, Sir, despite the fact that after it has been adopted, since three years, by the various State education ministers, conferences, by the Centre, by various other academic people, it is being implemented in such a manner that we have created more and more confusion all around.

We have created, as I said, nervousness among the people, among students and among parents. They do not know what next we are coming forward with. They are not quite sure whether a particular system wherein a child starts from the age of 5 would be assured of regular education till the age of 12, or something else will be introduced suddenly and he will be left high and dry. The whole educational system, as a result, has gone to ducks and drakes. What is the significance about the 10 *plus* 2 system? Instead of going in for higher education, it is much better, also in view of the growing educated unemployment, that we create a kind of technical skill which finishes at 12 class stage for students who do not have the aptitude, who do not have the means, who do not have the time at their disposal. Excellent idea! But what has happened? I can tell you about my State of Maharashtra which is considered one of the progressive and advanced States. Sir, this *plus* 2 system cannot work unless sufficient funds are made available—sufficient funds for equipment, sufficient resources for training teachers for that purpose and sufficient resources for text books. Sir, I have been wanting for the last two years to open a technological institute. I have procured more than ten lakh rupees for that purpose. The buildings are ready. I have got the equipments. But the curriculum is not yet ready. We adopted *plus* 2 system almost three years ago. Even today the text books are not ready. The curriculum is not ready. Teachers are not available. And we have introduced 10 *plus* 2 *plus* 3 system. Sir, I had asked the Education Minister a

[Dr. Rafiq Zakaria]

pointed question as to what are the funds which the Centre is going to place at the disposal of the State, as far as this *plus 2* part of the system is concerned. His reply was—a very nice way of saying—that they have provided ten thousand rupees for this, twenty thousand rupees for that. I was not asking that. I was asking if a proper assessment had been made in this regard, in particular what is required to make *plus 2* system a success. That alone can justify the *10 plus 2* system. Otherwise, what was wrong with our old system? We wanted this new system so that a large number of students are properly trained in the various technical fields—small artisans, small mechanics, etc. Sir, My friend on the other side stated that in the rural areas they do not have the funds. They do not have the resources even in the urban areas. Funds are, of course, the most important problem. But text books are not ready. The curriculum is not ready. Teachers are not available. And we are seeing that practically every State has adopted *10 plus 2 plus 3* system. We are going ahead. Are we going ahead in this way? These changes have created such a situation, I can tell you from my experience of Maharashtra. I am running about a dozen different institutions, institutions of higher education, and the problems that we have is nobody's business. That is why there is frustration among the students. We are creating a sense of frustration in them. We are not giving them a sense of fulfilment, as far as our whole system is concerned. What is happening in our Universities? They have become a breeding ground for all kinds of troubles. The autonomy of the University is the basis of a sound education, higher educational system. That is being adversely affected.

The Government then steps in. I will come to that later. But I would like to know from the Education Minister as to how much money is given. Sir, the States cannot bear this burden. I have been a Minister

for more than fifteen years and I can tell Mr. Chunder—He is new to the Government—that he should not go by what the experts advise him because the experts have the habit of presenting even black as white with an 'ease' which is very difficult to fathom. Let us be simple, honest and realistic and find out how much funds are at the disposal of the States for this purpose which will be apart from what they have been spending so far and how much the Centre is prepared to give for capital expenditure for the *plus two* pattern and how much for recurring expenses. What is being done for the training of the teachers? Even if we start this thing from today, it will take another 3 to 4 years. What is to happen to the present generation? What is to happen to those who have gone to the 11th and 12th classes with no education at all or with half-baked education because at least in the old system there were intensive studies in those particular fields because there was not this emphasis on the technical stream? Now that emphasis is taken away in the hope that we will be able to pursue the technical stream. As I was saying, the Education Minister should see that in this process also the conflict that has been created between Hindi and English is properly resolved. (*Time Bell rings.*) Otherwise, it is not only the people in the South who are suffering, but the people in the North are suffering more. Sir, unless we have the necessary text-books and there teachers available in the Hindi language, to take away the emphasis from English and still teaching them through the medium of English and producing half-baked doctors and half-baked engineers is the greatest disservice that we can do to this country. One of the finest institutions that we have created in this country is the Jawaharlal Nehru University.

SHRI N. G. RANGA (Andhra Pradesh): Has it really become one of the finest institutions?

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: I said 'created'. What I have been reading in the newspapers and what I have

been hearing here and there is really painful. I am not fully familiar with all the facts but the way people talk, that somebody is leftist, somebody is trying to do this and somebody is trying to do that and therefore they shall be removed, well this fine institution is being made to suffer. My friend, Shri Rasheeduddin Kan, is going to participate in this debate. I would request him because he is not only a Member of this House but he is also connected with that university, to tell us what exactly is happening and to take the House into confidence because these are the citadels of learning which we have built with some hopes and expectations and which should be kept free from the ravages of time.

Sir, now I come to the question of adult education. What I am hearing, if it is true, is also frightening. We have not done well in adult education at all. Adult education has been going on in an half-hearted manner with the result that while for show purposes we are making loud claims, there has not been any concrete result which should make us happy. Perhaps, the Education Minister has some new scheme under his consideration. I am told that in the guise of voluntary organisations, giving this work to voluntary organisation and earmarking almost 250 crores of rupees for this purpose, a certain sinister political mechanism is being created which will have very little to do with adult education, but which will strike at the very roots of our secular character.

I would like to know this from Mr. Chunder. I have full faith in his secularism and I know that he means well. The manner in which he has gone about as far as some of the legislations regarding some Universities are concerned, it is a hopeful sign. But as I said earlier, he should not fall into a trap of certain bureaucratic creations which while giving a cover to adult education are trying to achieve some other purpose. Sir, when I look at this whole picture of education, especially after all that was being said

during the elections, by the ruling party, all that was being said in the manifesto of the Janata Party and despite all the loyalty to the Gandhian ideals—some of the leaders are fond of swearing by them in season and out of season—despite all that, I get a feeling of nervousness, a feeling of fright that we are going about in our educational policy in an aimless way. Perhaps, the Education Minister has some objective, but I do not know it. Again, Sir, I am reminded of an Urdu couplet:

“बहुत मुमकिन अमीरे कारवां की कोई
मंजिल हो ,
मगर रस्तार अहले कारवां कुछ और
लगती है ।”

The way the whole caravan is going about, it is going about aimlessly, it is going about from confusion to confusion; the promises by their very nature becoming are incapable of being fulfilled. The patterns while looking perfectly all right on the paper, unless the wherewithals, the necessary requirements, the funds, the staff, the equipment are provided, they shall not produce the result. Therefore, I would plead with the Education Minister to clear this confusion. He told the other day that we were creating the confusion. Well, perhaps, the Opposition does that kind of a thing. Everywhere it does. But he should be in a position even if we have created any kind of confusion in the minds of people to clear it. He can do so if his aim is clear, if his objective is clear and if he knows where he is going. But, Sir, I find even the $10+2+3$ formula suddenly gets changed because the Prime Minister felt, “No, $10+2+3$ is not correct; it must be $8+4+3$ ” or some such thing. Then, Sir, the Cartoonist Laxman in his cartoon says “What does, it matter? You can put any figure so long as you come to that total.” Sir, are we totalling or are we having a pattern? It is that question that I am asking the Education Minister because, believe me, Sir, the parents are suffering from a kind of mental

[Dr. Rafiq Zakaria]

shock. They do not know what is going to be the future of their children. They just do not know. Sir, the way we are passing our students, nobody bothers whether one is really merit student or not. This is the worst disservice that we are doing to our educational system. If you have money, specially black money, you can get 80 per cent, 90 per cent marks and you can get easy access, easy entry into any medical college or engineering institution. I am not blaming the Education Minister for that. But I am only telling him that he has to take steps in such a way that this kind of a situation which has been prevailing in our country does not prevail any longer. Otherwise, people will lose faith in the whole system and if they lose faith in the system, Sir, our future itself becomes a question mark.

3 P.M.

डा० लोकेश चन्द्र (नाम-निर्देशित):
उपसभापति महोदय, मेरे मित्र डा० रफीक जकारिया ने जो बात कही मैं उनकी एक-एक बात का समर्थन करता हूँ और मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने बहुत मौलिक प्रश्न उठाये हैं कि शिक्षा का क्या माध्यम हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि शिक्षा का माध्यम पढ़ने वाले पर छोड़ दिया जाय। उससे बहुत सा संघर्ष समाप्त हो जाएगा। परन्तु जैसे हम हिन्दी भाषा नहीं लादना चाहते हैं, कोई भाषा नहीं लादना चाहते हैं तो बहुत से ऐसे विद्यार्थी भी हैं जो अंग्रेजी भी लदवाना नहीं चाहते हैं। इसके लिये मैं उदाहरण देने वाला हूँ। मैं हूँ, मेरी इच्छा नहीं है अंग्रेजी बोलने की, पढ़ने की, जैसे मुझे इस सदन में स्वतंत्रता दे रखी है कि हिन्दी में बोलूँ, उर्दू में बोलूँ, तमिल में बोलूँ या तेलुगु में बोलूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो एक नया शिष्ट है, एक नया वच्चा है उसको भी अपनी भाषा के द्वारा ज्ञान पाने का अधिकार रहे।

डा० रफीक जकारिया ने बहुत अच्छी बात कही कि जो हमारे देश में अल्पसंख्यक

वर्ग है, भाषा की दृष्टि से या धार्मिक दृष्टि से, उनको पूरी स्वतंत्रता होनी चाहिये कि वे अपनी भाषा के माध्यम से पढ़ सकें। प्रत्येक देश में संसार के जो भी अल्पसंख्यक हैं उनको विशेष अधिकार हैं। सोवियत संघ में कोई डेढ़ सौ के लगभग भाषाएँ बोली जाती हैं। सोवियत संघ में छोटे से छोटे अल्पसंख्यक वर्ग को प्रत्येक सुविधा दिलाई जाती है। वे अपनी प्रारम्भिक शिक्षा, अपनी पहली पांच-छः वर्ष की शिक्षा, अपनी भाषा के द्वारा पा सकते हैं। जहाँ तक माध्यम भाषा का प्रश्न है मैं समझता हूँ यह प्रत्येक व्यक्ति के ऊपर छोड़ दिया जाए। इंग्लैंड में शिक्षा के बारे में जो नई धारा चल रही है जिसे उन्होंने बोलिशनल प्रिंसिपल किया है यानी स्वेच्छा से वह व्यक्ति किसी भाषा में अपनी शिक्षा पा सकता है। इस दृष्टि से हम लोग त्रि-भाषा तक सीमित करें या एक भाषा में या दो भाषा में, मैं समझता हूँ यह सब विद्यार्थियों पर छोड़ दिया जाए विशेष रूप से अल्प संख्यकों के अधिकारों का, जो कि संविधान में पूरे रूप से स्वीकार किया गया है, मंत्री महोदय के ऊपर एक विशेष दायित्व है कि उनके अधिकारों की रक्षा के लिये अधिक से अधिक पैसा दें जिससे कि देश के अन्दर जो शिक्षा पद्धति इस समय चल रही है वह सामंजस्य पूर्वक चलती रहे।

शिक्षा के अन्दर एक बड़े महत्व का प्रश्न रह गया जिसे हमारे मित्र श्री रफीक जकारिया ने नहीं उठाया, वह है जीवन मूल्यों का। हम लोग जब से स्वतंत्र हुए तब से हमने अपनी शिक्षा के अन्दर भाषा के प्रश्न को उठाया। उसका क्या विषय-वस्तु हो, क्या कांटेक्ट हों, यह प्रश्न नहीं उठाया गया। सार जीवन परिवर्तन शील है। शिक्षा के विषय-वस्तु का परिवर्तन होता है, और डाँचे में भी परिवर्तन होता है। जब सब कुछ परिवर्तन होता है तो उस परिवर्तन के साथ हमने चलने का प्रयत्न किया या नहीं, मैं समझता हूँ कि परिवर्तन के साथ, हमने चलने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया। इसलिये बहुत सी

उलझनें खड़ी हो उठी हैं। वास्तव में शिक्षा मनुष्य की, प्रकृति की एक अन्तः क्रिया है। प्रेयागराज में जैसे त्रिवेणी है और वहां तीन नदियां आकर मिलती हैं वैसे ही मनुष्य, प्रकृति और उनकी अन्तः क्रिया से उत्पन्न ज्ञान या विज्ञान है उसका एक समन्वय बनता है और उसी को हम लोग शिक्षा कहते हैं। शिक्षा केवल लोगों के ऊपर ज्ञान थोपने की बात नहीं है। मनुष्य कंप्यूटर नहीं है जिसके अन्दर एक हजार तथ्य डाल दें, एक लाख तथ्य डाल दें। पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने शिक्षा के लक्ष्यो की ओर संकेत करते हुए बहुत सुन्दर कहा है। उनका अंग्रेजी में कथन है इसलिये मैं अंग्रेजी में ही पढ़ना चाहता हूं क्योंकि उनकी भाषा में विशेष लक्षण और व्यंजना है। उद्धरण इस प्रकार है :

"Can we combine the progress of science and technology with the progress of mind and spirit also? We cannot be untrue to science because that represents the basic facts of life today. Still less, can we be untrue to those essential principles for which India has stood in the past throughout the ages? Let us then pursue our path to industrial progress with all our strength and vigour and, at the same time, remember that material riches without toleration and compassion and wisdom may turn to dust and ashes."

यदि हम शिक्षा को समग्र रूप में देखते हैं तो हमारी शिक्षा में पिछले तीस वर्षों में उल्लेखनीय उन्नति हुई है। यदि आप अमेरिका के किसी बड़े बड़े से विश्वविद्यालय में चल जायें, नासा में चले जायें जो अमरीका की अन्तरिक्ष अनुसंधान की सर्वोच्च संस्था है उसके अन्दर ऊंचे से ऊंचे वैज्ञानिकों में भारतीय मिलेंगे। अमेरिका में गणित में भी विशेषकर शुद्ध गणित में भारतीयों का आदरणीय स्थान है। यह हमारे लिये,

हमारी शिक्षा के लिये सबसे बड़े गौरव की बात है कि भारत के लोग जहां कहीं भी जाते हैं जैसा रफीक जकारिया साहब ने कहा, चारों ओर उनकी प्रशंसा है।

पिछले कुछ दिनों में भाषा के संबंध में हम लोगों के सामने कुछ कठिनाइयां जरूर आई हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि जहां तक उच्च शिक्षा का संबंध है, भाषा का बन्धन समाप्त प्रायः है। उच्च शिक्षा के लिए लगभग अंग्रेजी भाषा का उपयोग आरम्भ कर दिया है। चाहे दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण क्यों न हो हमारे देश के अन्दर बहुत ही छोटे लोग हैं, जिनके पास इतने साधन और रुपये नहीं हैं कि वे अपने बच्चों को अंग्रेजी भाषा के माध्यम से शिक्षा दे सके, उनके बच्चे पब्लिक स्कूलों में पढ़ने के लिए नहीं जा सकते हैं। यही कारण है कि वे लोग अपने जीवन में प्रगति नहीं कर पाते हैं और वैज्ञानिक प्रगति के क्षेत्र में भी पिछड़ जाते हैं। इस कारण भारतीय भाषाओं को ही शिक्षा का आधार बनाया जा सकता है।

श्रीमन्, मैं सबसे पहले प्राथमिक शिक्षा को लेना चाहता हूं। हमारे देश के संविधान की धारा 45 के अनुसार प्राथमिक शिक्षा पूरे देश में व्याप्त होनी चाहिए। लेकिन प्राथमिक शिक्षा का हमारे देश में पूरी तरह से प्रचार नहीं हो पाया। इसके कुछ कारण रहे। धन का अभाव रहा और हम प्राथमिक शिक्षा को सारे देश के अन्दर नहीं फैला पाये। अब हमारे नये मंत्री जी आए हैं। उनके मन में प्राथमिक शिक्षा को फैलाने के लिए उतनी ही आस्था है जितनी हम लोगों के

[डा० लोकेश चन्द्र]

मन में है । प्राथमिक शिक्षा के संबंध में हमारे देश में अब तक जो काम हुए हैं उनमें बड़े बड़े विद्वानों की समितियां हमारे मंत्रालय की तरफ से बैठाई गई हैं । उनके अन्दर एक भी ऐसा आदमी नहीं होता जिसका गांवों से कोई संबंध रहा हो । मेरे पास प्राथमिक एजुकेशन के बारे में जो प्रतिवेदन है उसमें कई बातें लिखी गई हैं । इसमें एक प्रस्ताव शिक्षा मंत्रियों ने भी लिखा है और यह कहा है कि हमारे देश में 6 से 14 वर्ष के बच्चों को शिक्षा दी जाएगी और साथ ही साथ इसमें एक बड़ी भयंकर बात लिख दी गई है

Without insisting on
compulsory school attendance.

मैं इस बात को इसलिए उठा रहा हूं कि बहुत से गांवों में जो लोग शिक्षा देने के लिए रुपया पाते हैं, अध्यापक हैं, वे दिन भर अपनी खेती के काम में लगे रहते हैं । स्कूलों में पढ़ाने के लिए नहीं जाते हैं । विद्यार्थी ममझते हैं कि हमारे गुरु जी बहुत अच्छे हैं क्योंकि उनको पढ़ने के लिये कोई कष्ट नहीं करना पड़ता । यद्यपि हमारे राज्यों के विभाग शिक्षा पर पूरा रुपया लगाते हैं, परन्तु उसका लाभ कुछ भी नहीं हो पाता है, यदि मैं यह कहूं कि उसका शून्य लाभ होता है तो अशुद्ध नहीं होगा । इस प्रकार से इस प्रस्ताव के अन्दर एक बात यह रख दी गई कि बच्चों को स्कूल में उपस्थित होने की जरूरत नहीं है । इसका भयंकर परिणाम यह होगा कि बच्चे स्कूल में पढ़ नहीं पाएंगे और अध्यापक उनको पढ़ाने नहीं आएगा । वह अपनी खेती अर्थात् अन्य काम में लगा रहेगा । मैं समझता हूं कि इसके परिणामस्वरूप देश में शिक्षा पिछड़ जाएगी । इस दृष्टि से देखा जाय तो यह बात जो प्रस्ताव में लिखी गई है, यह ठीक नहीं है ।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा की एक बड़ी आवश्यकता यह है कि उसको ग्रामों की आवश्यकताओं के अनुरूप बनाया जाय । जिम शिक्षा का मेरे जीवन से संबंध नहीं उसको मैं क्यों पढ़ूं । जो ज्योमिट्री, एलजब्रा मैंने अपने शिक्षा काल में पढ़ी । वह मेरे किसी काम नहीं आई । गणित मेरे काम नहीं आया । इस प्रकार की शिक्षा से क्या लाभ ? मैं समझता हूं कि हमारी सारी की सारी प्राथमिक शिक्षा के बारे में कई समितियों ने सुझाव दिये हैं । परन्तु जब उन सुझावों को कार्यान्वित करने का प्रश्न आता है तो कठिनाइयां पैदा हो जाती हैं । मंत्रालय के अन्दर कुछ इस प्रकार का जादू या चमत्कार हो जाता है कि जो हमारे देश में ग्रामों की दिशा है और ग्रामों के प्रति हमारे अन्दर जो रुझान होना चाहिए वह बिल्कुल औझल हो जाता है । मंत्री जी और अधिकारीगण ग्रामों की स्थिति को भूल जाते हैं । इस प्रकार के कामों में गांवों को जो स्थान दिया जाना चाहिए वह नहीं दिया जाता है । प्राथमिक शिक्षा के बारे में जितने भी सम्मेलन होते हैं वे सब दिल्ली में होते हैं । कभी भी गांवों में कोई सम्मेलन नहीं होता है । गांवों के चौधरी लोग इन सम्मेलनों में भाग नहीं लेते हैं । एक बात आपातकाल में मदनगौर में एक सभा हुई ग्राम की समस्याओं को देखने का नया दृष्टिकोण उपस्थित हुआ । वहां पर गांवों के लोगों को बुलाया और कहा कि तुम लोग बोलो । हम लोगों को यह नहीं समझना चाहिए कि जितना भी ज्ञान है वह हम को ही है और गांवों के लोग तब कुछ नहीं जानते हैं, वे निरक्षर हैं । यह ठीक है कि साहित्यिक भाषा में वे लोग अनपढ़ होते हैं । लेकिन उनके अपने संस्कार हैं, अपनी संस्कृति है । चाहे उनका धर्म कोई भी हो, वह उनके लिए एक बहुमूल्य तत्व है । ऐसी स्थिति में आवश्यकता

इस बात की है कि जब हम प्राथमिक शिक्षा की चिन्ता करते हैं या प्रौढ़ शिक्षा की चिन्ता करते हैं तो उसमें हम गांव वालों का सहयोग लें। शिक्षा के संबंध में जितनी भी समितियां बनती हैं उनमें पढ़े-लिखे लोग ही रखे जाते हैं। गांव वालों को हम उनमें कोई स्थान नहीं देते हैं और समझते हैं कि ग्रामवासी गंवार है, अनपढ़ है, जिनके अन्दर कोई जीवन दृष्टि नहीं, कोई जीवन-मूल्य नहीं है। हम उनको घटिया समझते हैं। जब तक हम प्राथमिक शिक्षा के संबंध में ग्रामीणों का सहयोग नहीं लेंगे तब तक हमारे देश में शिक्षा की नीति कभी सफल नहीं हो सकती है। तो मंत्री महोदय से मेरा ठोस सुझाव यह है कि ग्रामोन्मुख शिक्षा का प्रतिपादन करें। गांव के लोगों से कुछ समझें। गांव के चौधरियों की जीवन की प्रतिभा है वे आपसे मिल कर चर्चा कर सकते हैं कि उन्हें शिक्षा में क्या चाहिए। आप उन्हें जो शिक्षा देते हैं, मुझे तो सन्देह होता है यह शिक्षा उनके काम आएगी या नहीं आएगी। गांव वालों की भयंकर समस्याएं हैं। दिल्ली के आमपास जाएं, गांव वाले अंग्रेजी तो पढ़कर बहुत दुखी रहते हैं। वह मुझ से कहते हैं कि आपको अंग्रेजी पढ़ाने की आवश्यकता नहीं, हमें अंग्रेजी क्यों पढ़ा रहे हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि गांव में प्राथमिक शिक्षा बच्चों को मातृभाषा में दी जाये। मातृभाषा आवश्यक नहीं कि हिन्दी ही हो, मातृभाषा उर्दू हो सकती है, तामिल, तेलगु, राजस्थानी, हरियाणवी भी हो सकती है। उसके द्वारा पढ़ाए तो विद्यार्थी अधिक रुचि से पढ़ेंगे और पढ़ने में भी उसकी रुचि बढ़ेगी। पढ़ने से वह उबेगा नहीं। उसको वाक्य सोच कर नहीं बनाने पड़ेंगे।

शिक्षा का एक जो पक्ष है जिस के विषय में कभी ध्यान नहीं जाता। कई बच्चों को तो वर्तमान शिक्षा इतना भारी लगता है कि वे निश्चय करते हैं कि वे कैसे छुटकारा पाएं।

पिछले दिनों 'सूर्य' पत्रिका में एक बहुत सुन्दर लेखा निकला जिसका शीर्षक भा 'अल्टीमेन डिफेंस' उसने जो उदाहरण दिया हुआ है वह पढ़ कर नहीं सुनाना चाहता हूं एक बच्चे को पढ़ना बोझ लगता है, वह सोचता है कि मैं पढ़ नहीं सकता हूं, मेरे लिए शिक्षा अति भारी है, भाषा समझ नहीं आती, कुछ समझ नहीं आता। "अंत में जाकर वह आत्म-हत्या कर लेता है। शिक्षा ऐसी नहीं होनी चाहिए जो बच्चों को इस बात के लिए प्रेरित करे कि वे आत्म-हत्या के विषम पथ तक पहुंचे प्राथमिक शिक्षा को उनके जीवन के साथ कुछ न कुछ लगा हुआ होना चाहिए। हमारी जो शिक्षा की पद्धति है, हम आज नगरों में जो शिक्षा दे रहे हैं उसका केवल एक लक्ष्य है, शासन की सेवा करना, सरकारी नौकरी है। वह जब तक रहेगा तब तक आप भी कष्ट में रहेंगे, और देश भी कष्ट में रहेगा, शिक्षा निरर्थक रहेगी।

सन्देह होता है कि मंत्री जी संविधान की 45वीं धारा का पालन करना नहीं चाहते। वह इस बात से होता है कि आपने प्रौढ़ शिक्षा के लिए 200-250 करोड़ रुपया देने का निश्चय किया है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि यह आपने किस बजट में से किया है? कहां से रुपया निकाल कर आपने इसके लिए व्यवस्था की है? प्रौढ़ शिक्षा पर रुपया लगाना सार्थक अवश्य है क्योंकि जब माता पिता पढ़ जाते हैं, तब अपने बच्चों को पढ़ने के लिए प्रेरित करते हैं। माता-पिता अगर शिक्षित होंगे तो बच्चों को पढ़ने लिखने के लिए सुविधा भी होगी। यदि कम पढ़ें तो बच्चों को कम प्रेरण दे पायेंगे यदि अधिक पढ़ें तो अधिक दे पायेंगे। साथ ही साथ व्यावहारिक प्रश्न यह है कि जो माता पिता नहीं पढ़ें तो वे अपने बच्चों को कैसे पढ़ा पायेंगे? अध्यापक पूरा पाठ्य-क्रम नहीं पढ़ा पाते। मेरा अनुभव है हमें स्वयं

[डॉ० लालकृष्ण मेहरा]

अपने बच्चों को पढ़ाना पड़ता है। उनको काम मिल जाता है। माता-पिता का कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि बच्चों को पढ़ाई पूरा करायें उनकी पढ़ाई अच्छे से अच्छे ढंग से पूरी करें। इस दृष्टि से प्रौढ़ शिक्षा आवश्यक है। परन्तु इसमें एक भय है इसके अन्दर आपने राजनैतिक दलों को डाल दिया है। राजनैतिककरण शिक्षा की हत्या का प्रारम्भ है। आज तक किसी मंत्री ने शिक्षा का इतना राजनैतिकीकरण नहीं किया जितना कि आपने अल्पकाल में प्रौढ़ शिक्षा के नाम से 250 करोड़ रुपया दे कर किया है। आपने इसको — राजनीति के मुख में डालने की प्रतिभा कर ली है। यह किस दल को देंगे, यह प्रश्न नहीं है। मौलिक प्रश्न है कि शिक्षा को आप राजनीति का भाग क्यों बनाना चाहते हैं। हमारा एक ऐसा देश है जिसमें शिक्षा कभी राजनीति का भाग नहीं रही। संसार में केवल दो राष्ट्र हैं जिनमें प्राचीन काल से शिक्षा राज्य का एक भाग रही। एक है चीन जिसमें कन्फ्यूशियस ने अपरिहार्य रूप से निर्धारित किया कि शिक्षा देना राजा का कर्तव्य है और दूसरा रोम जिसके अन्दर शिक्षा राज्य का अंग था। हमारे देश में राज्य का शिक्षा से दूर का संबंध भी नहीं था। ग्रीस में भी शिक्षा राज्य से दूर थी। इंडो-यूरोपियन परम्परा है कि शिक्षा विद्वानों की सम्पत्ति है, उसका परिपोषण करना, उसको आग बढ़ाना, उसके अन्दर नये आयाम बनाना विद्वानों का कर्तव्य है। प्रोफसर म्दरफोर्ड ने कैम्ब्रिज यूनिवर्सिटी की केवेंडिश लबोरेटरी में जब परमाणु को विस्फोट का अनुसंधान किया तो लोग उसे नहीं समझते थे और कहते थे कि इसमें क्या होगा। परन्तु भविष्य में सिद्ध कर दिया कि परमाणु विज्ञान मनुष्य की प्रगति का एक महत्वपूर्ण केन्द्र है। और उस विस्फोट में नये सिद्धांत निकले जा नयी प्रगति का आधार बने उस दृष्टि से शिक्षा को राजनीति से अलग रखना

आवश्यक है। आपने जो प्रौढ़ शिक्षा का राजनीतिकरण किया वह बड़ा भयंकर पग है। आप जब राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा नीति बनायें तो प्रौढ़ शिक्षा को राजनीति के पंजे से निकालकर, उसके शिकंजे से निकालकर, उसका विधान विद्वान पुरुषों को दें। सारे देश में राजनीति छाती जा रही है, और उसका बड़ा भयंकर परिणाम है। दिल्ली के अंदर बहुत सी प्रतिमाएं लगी हैं, केवल तमिलनाडु का एक भवन है जहां पर एक विद्वान पुरुष की प्रतिमा है और अन्यत्र तो केवल राजनीतिज्ञों की प्रतिमाएं ही लगी हैं। जब प्रायः आप समाचार पत्र खोलते हैं उसमें किसी भी बड़े वैज्ञानिक का नाम नहीं, कवि का नाम नहीं, लेखक का नाम नहीं और अगर है भी तो एक छोटे से स्थान पर। यह देश के लिए एक बड़ी अंधकारमय स्थिति है। इस अंधेरे को बढ़ाने में मंत्री महोदय ने एक और आयाम डालने का प्रयत्न किया है।

फिर एक हायर सेकेंडरी की शिक्षा को लें, यद्यपि 10+2 सिद्धांत से ठीक है परन्तु +2 देश के लिए आर्थिक दृष्टि से भयंकर है। हम +2 को पूरे देश में लगाने के लिए रुपया दे नहीं सकते हैं यदि आप +2 लागू करना चाहते हैं तो आपको प्रौढ़ एजुकेशन को समाप्त करना पड़ेगा। +2 के अंदर कितना व्यय होगा इसकी कल्पना नहीं की गई। एक स्कूल के अंदर +2 लगाने के लिए तीन लाख रुपया चाहिए होगा और वह भी एक छोटी सी प्रयोगशाला, छोटा सा भवन जिसके अंदर 40-50 विद्यार्थी काम कर सकें। यदि आप उत्तर प्रदेश में जायेंगे तो वहां बहुत से इंटर कालेज पायेंगे उनमें +2 की पढ़ाई हो सकती है, इनको स्कूलों से क्यों नहीं जोड़ते। यह मुझे समझ में नहीं आया। इन इंटर कालेजों को छोड़ना भयंकर भूल होगी। यद्यपि +2 की पृष्ठभूमि ही है।

परन्तु इसके क्रियान्वयन के बारे में सोचना पड़ेगा। उत्तर प्रदेश के पांच छः हजार इन्टर कालेज निरर्थक हो जायेंगे यदि आप +2 का स्कूलों में लायेंगे। +2 को सफल बनाने के लिए विद्यमान साधनों से समन्वय के बारे में सोचना चाहिए। क्या मंत्री महोदय ने उनके बारे में चिंतन किया है। जैसे कि मुझ से पहले रफीक साहब ने कहा हमारा वर्तमान शासन ही पूर्णतः अनिश्चयग्रस्त है। 'संशयाला विनश्यति' सब बातों में संदेह घरे हुये हैं। कहीं कोई निर्णय नहीं कर सकते हैं प्रत्येक बात संदेहास्पद हो रही है। इसमें एक और मूल्य बढ़ रहे हैं और दूसरी और शिक्षा का अक्षमूल्य हो रहा है। जीवन इतने अनिश्चय के अंदर चलते-चलते किसी दिन खाई के अंदर पहुंच जायेगा। +2 के बारे में भी ठीक-ठीक निर्णय करने की आवश्यकता है। जो हमारे सीमित साधन हैं हम उनका दुरुपयोग न करें, अनुपयोग न करें। ऐसा न हो कि उत्तर प्रदेश के इन्टर कालेज तथा और प्रदेशों में भी इसी प्रकार की व्यवस्थाएं जो कालेज का भाग रहीं, हम इन्हें भूल जायें। हम सोचें कि क्या समन्वय हो सकता है ?

व्यवसायिक प्रशिक्षण की आज बड़ी आवश्यकता है तो यह +2 में एक बहुत अच्छा पक्ष है। हमारे देश में बहुत स्थानों पर आई० टी० आई० अर्थात् व्यवसायिक प्रशिक्षण संस्थान हैं। इन आई० टी० आई० के अंदर शिक्षा विस्तार से दी जाती है परन्तु सब सैद्धांतिक है, कर्मनिष्ठ नहीं है। इसके अंदर व्यक्ति सिद्धांत जान जाता है, काम नहीं। यदि इस में प्रशिक्षित नल ठीक करने वाला है, वह सिद्धान्त अवश्य जानता है परन्तु जब नलका ठीक करना पड़ता है तब वह नलका ठीक नहीं कर सकता है दूसरी बात यह है कि उसका मन नहीं करता है नल को हाथ लगाने को, वह कहता है कि श्रमिक को दुलाओ, वह नल खोलेगा और ठीक करवायेगा, मैं तो पढ़ा लिखा व्यक्ति

हूँ। तो जितने आई० टी० आई० हैं, जितनी व केशनल एजुकेशन है इसके बारे में हमें सोचना पड़ेगा। वह केवल सैद्धांतिक शिक्षा न हो, शिक्षा के साथ-साथ व्यक्ति को, एक चेतना दी जाये, एक कर्मबुद्धि दी जाये, उसको कर्मयोगी बनाया जाये जिसको कि उसे काम करने में किसी प्रकार की शिक्षक न हो। गांधी जी भी अपने आश्रम में लोगों से कहते थे कि अपना मल-मूत्र अपने आप उठाओ। जीवन की यह सब से बड़ी शिक्षा है किसी ने दो पुस्तकें पढ़ ली या 20 पुस्तकें पढ़ ली इसमें कोई प्रगति नहीं है यदि व्यक्ति अपने जीवन की आवश्यकताओं को दूसरों के सहारे के बिना नहीं चला सकता तो यह धिवकार के योग्य है और कम से कम जो वोकेशनल में जाता है, व्यवसाय में जाता है उसके लिए यह परम आवश्यक है कि वह कर्मयोगी हो।

समय कम है। विश्वविद्यालय की शिक्षा के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। विश्वविद्यालय बहुत अच्छा काम कर रहे हैं। पर कुछ वर्षों से इनके अंदर राजनीति अधिक घुसती जा रही है। हमारी शिक्षा का सबसे बड़ा अभिशाप उसका राजनीतिकरण है...

विश्व के नेता (श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी):
विश्वविद्यालय तो सब बंद हैं भाई।

डा० लोकेश चन्द्र : चलिए हमारे नेता कह रहे हैं कि विश्वविद्यालय बंद हैं तो वह तो और भी बड़ा अभिशाप है, महा अभिशाप है। इसका एक महत्वपूर्ण कारण है, कि हमारे शिक्षक शिक्षा से बहुत दूर जाते जा रहे हैं, आदर्शों से बहुत दूर जाते जा रहे हैं। प्रत्येक विषय में विभागाध्यक्ष को जैसे रोटेशन में कर दिया, आवर्तण में कर दिया। इसी प्रकार उपकुलपति को भी वार्ड रोटेशन किया जाए। हमारे यहां जो वाइस-चान्सलर न्यायालय से आते हैं, अथवा आई० ए० एम० में

[डा० लोकेश चन्द्र]

आ जाते हैं उन का शिक्षा से, विद्यार्थियों के मनो में परिचय नहीं होता है। जो आई० ए० एस० आता है, वह समझता है कि जैसे पुलिस, क्लर्कों को, प्रशासन के कार्यालय को चलाते हैं वैसे ही शिक्षा संस्थान को भी चला सकते हैं। पर विद्यार्थी को आप धकेल कर नहीं चला सकते। विश्वविद्यालय के ही प्राध्यापक अपनी बरीयता/सीनियरिटी के अनुसार यदि उपकुलपति बनते जाएं, तो विद्यार्थियों का असंतोष है वह बहुत कुछ खत्म हो सकता है। विश्वविद्यालय के सब स्तरों पर विद्यार्थियों का सहयोग हो। आज विद्यार्थी के प्रति अध्यापक न सौहार्द दिखाते हैं और न प्रशिक्षण देते हैं। उमक लिए बहुत आवश्यक है कि विद्यार्थियों का भी सारे प्रबंध में अधिकार हो और वे अपनी समस्या में स्वयं समाधान कर सकें।

एक महत्वपूर्ण बात अनुसंधान की है। मैंने कुछ प्रतिवेदनों में सुझाव दिया है कि अनुसंधान एक ही प्रकार का है और उसके अन्तर ओझल कर दिए जायें। अनुसंधान दो प्रकार का है, एक शुद्ध अनुसंधान है जो केवल विद्या-वर्जन के लिए होता है। जब रथरफोर्ड ने परमाणु तोड़ा, उस समय परमाणु का तोड़ना आर्थिक कार्य नहीं था। परन्तु पोछे जाकर वह आर्थिक रूप से महत्वपूर्ण बन गया। उसका समाज के लिए महत्व हो गया। अनुसंधान का दूसरा प्रकार व्यवहारगम्य अनुसंधान (एप्लाइड रिसर्च) है जिसको बोकेशनल रिसर्च भी कहते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इन दोनों को अलग अलग रखा जाए। विश्वविद्यालयों से शुद्ध अनुसंधान के काम अच्छे हो सकेंगे। जब तक अनुसंधान मिला-जुला है और हम लोग निश्चित नहीं कर पायेंगे कि विश्वविद्यालयों का अनुसंधान में क्या कर्तव्य है, वैज्ञानिकों, संस्थानों और विभागों का क्या कर्तव्य है। आज शासन के अन्दर कोई मंत्रालय अनुसंधान में लगे हुए हैं। ईन भी अधिक अनुसंधान कार्य नहीं हो पाता

यद्यपि रुपया बहुत लग जाता है। जब हम आंकड़े देखते हैं कि अनुसंधान के लिए इतना रुपया लगाया, वास्तव में वह रुपया विज्ञान पर, अनुसंधान के लिए नहीं लगता। वह सारा रुपया एसटैब्लिशमेंट चार्जज में चला जाता है, जैसे अन्तरिक्ष विभाग, ऊर्जा मंत्रालय, न्यूक्लियर एनर्जी है, सायन्स एण्ड टेक्नालॉजी विभाग, कृषि इत्यादि व्यवहारिक अनुसंधान होता है। शुद्ध विद्या पक्ष की अवहेलना होती है। यह अवहेलना न हो। इस के लिए विश्वविद्यालयों से स मन्वयन होना चाहिए और जो शुद्ध अनुसंधान है वह शुद्ध रूप से विश्वविद्यालय का दायित्व होना चाहिए। और सब रुपया इनको दिया जाना चाहिए। इस से काम अच्छा होगा, अधिक मात्रा में होगा और देश अधिक प्रगति कर सकेगा और पंडित जी का जो स्वप्न था कि देश में विज्ञान भी हो, ज्ञान भी हो और मनुष्य की चेतना हो वह सफल हो सकेगा।

अन्त में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सारी शिक्षा में सांस्कृतिक धारा भी बहनी चाहिए। उसके अन्दर जीवन मूल्य होना चाहिए। जब विद्यार्थी पूछते हैं कि क्या करूंगा उसका, अर्थ है कि उस के अन्दर आत्मविश्वास नहीं है। अविश्वास का भाव विद्यार्थियों को बहुत सताता है। मंत्री महोदय का कर्तव्य है कि विश्वास को विद्यार्थी के अन्दर जगाएं कि मेरा जो भविष्य है उसको मैं आप बनाऊंगा, उसे मंत्री महोदय नहीं बनायेंगे या संसद सदस्य नहीं बनायेगा। जो आत्म विश्वास से अनुप्राणित चलता है उसकी धारणा और सृजनशीलता अलग होती है। सृजनशीलता उसको आगे ले जाती है और उसकी समाप्ति उसकी समाधि बन जाती है।

एक और विशेष बात है कि जो शिक्षा हम चला रहे हैं, वह देश की मुख्य धारा उससे बहुत दूर है। देश के 80 प्रतिशत लोगों से पढ़े लिखे लोग दूर हो जाते हैं। जैसा मेरे मित्र डा० एफीक जफरीया ने कहा कि ऐसी शिक्षा

न हो, ऐसी पुस्तक न हों कि बच्चे पढ़ कर आएँ और कहे कि मेरा पिता मूर्ख है और आज की शिक्षा में प्रायः यह हो रहा है। विशेषकर ग्रामों में जहां पिता अनपढ़ है, बच्चा आकर माता-पिता से कहता है कि तुम्हें कुछ नहीं आता। सारे परिवार का प्रेम और आदर और श्रद्धा गिरने लगती है और शिक्षा अमानवीय बनती जाती है। अमानवीय शिक्षा में कोई लाभ नहीं हो सकता है।

अंत में मैं केवल एक-दो उद्धरण सुनाना चाहूंगा जो सारे के सारे समाज मानवीकरण पर है। मानवीकरण पर पश्चिम के देशों में बहुत काम हो रहा है, 1977 के जून-जुलाई में युगोस्लाविया में एक सम्मेलन हुआ, जिसका विषय था 'प्रगति के मानवीय पक्ष'। बहुत से लेख प्रस्तुत किए। प्रो० रात्स के लेख से एक उद्धरण सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

"Humane Aspects of Progress:
There are however cases where the positive role of engineering in medicines is less obvious. 'Over-engineering' does not always mean more humanization, it can sometimes mean questionable humanisation, perhaps even dehumanisation."

हमारा ही ऐसा देश है जो इस अमानवीकरण की, इस डी-ह्यूमेनाइजेशन की प्रक्रिया को रोक सकता है; सारा संसार हम से आशा करता है। हम स्वयं नया आदर्श प्रस्तुत करें। हमारी जो नयी शिक्षा नीति निश्चय ही पाश्चात्य शिक्षा की जो धारणाएँ हैं उनसे ही प्रेरित नहीं। उस में अपनापन भी हो और आधुनिकता भी हो। आधुनिकता में अग्रदूत पश्चिमी देश हैं। मुझे कोई लज्जा नहीं है कहने में—कि हमें पश्चिमी देशों से बहुत कुछ सीखना है। परन्तु उसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि पश्चिमी देशों से ही हमें सब कुछ सीखना है। अंतगोत्वा में श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के एक दीक्षांत भाषण से, जो उन्होंने 14 नवम्बर, 1969 को दिया था, सुनाना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि यह इस प्रसंग में बहुत सार्थक है।

"Education is not merely an accumulation of knowledge for knowledge can soon be out of date, but a means of stimulating the capacity to think, to learn and to innovate and to apply in the interest of larger causes."

यदि इन विराट कार्यों के लिए, इन विशाल आदर्शों के लिए हमने देश को कुछ देना है तो आप को सोचना होगा कि नयी नीति निर्धारित करते समय उस में केवल शिक्षा शास्त्रियों को ही स्थान न हो पर मानव शास्त्रियों का भी स्थान हो, ग्रामीणों का भी स्थान हो और सारे के सारे चिंतन में केवल 10 या 5 प्रतिशत के लिए शिक्षा निर्धारित न की जाए बल्कि देश के 80-85 प्रतिशत उन लोगों का भी ध्यान हो, और उन के जीवन मूल्यों का भी ध्यान हो जो इस देश को सदा जीता रखे रहे हैं और जिन्होंने जब कि और देश संसार से समाप्त हो गए, इस देश को शाश्वत रूप में जीवित रखा।

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, only very very recently we have had an occasion to debate on the educational policies of the Government when in the last session we had reviewed the working of the Ministry. I thought that probably it is now too early to have a very meaningful discussion today on the issues which have been debated very comprehensively very recently. But since the occasion has now come, we shall try to refresh our thinking on some of the major issues that confront our educational policy.

Sir, the problem with the educational policy is that it has not been so much a matter of fundamental difference of policies that worries us. The question has been more of implementation of policy, of understanding these policies correctly, of applying these policies at the gross root level. It is here that we are really stuck up. If we look at the history of educational policy, even in the pre-independen-

[Prof. Ramlal Parikh]

days some of the issues were such on which there were hardly differences. Take, for example, universal, free education. Was there any difference? But the question remains unresolved. Nobody would be quarrelling that adult education is essential and is so imperative. But, Sir, the question is how do we implement all these policies, how do we arrive at an agreement on the application of these policies.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
पारिख साहब गुजरात विद्यार्पाठ के वाइस
चांसलर रहे हैं, मैं उन से प्रार्थना करूंगा,
मातृभाषा में बोलें ।

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: Sir, I appreciate it but since we are....

DR. V. P. DUTT (Nominated): I think it is very wrong for anyone to try to force anyone to speak in any particular language. Let him speak in English. Please continue.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: Since we all just heard Dr. Zakaria about the three-language formula, I would rather not make it an issue about speaking in a particular language.

शिक्षा, समाज कल्याण और संस्कृति मंत्री
(श्री प्रताप चन्द्र चन्द्र) : मैं बंगला
में बोलूंगा ।

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: Because we are all committed to the three-language formula and we can use one of them....

DR. V. P. DUTT: But speaking in Hindi is not....
(Interruptions)

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : मैंने मातृ भाषा
कहा है । आप समझिए ।

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: Mr. Kalp Nath Rai knows that I took my oath in this House in my mother tongue, Gujarati, and not in Hindi.

DR. V. P. DUTT: And I will speak in Punjabi.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: I will speak in Bengali.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : यह तो बड़ी अच्छी
बात होगी ।

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: But that was not meant to create any barrier between our communication. As far as I am standing here, I am looking at all the sides and trying to communicate something. I may communicate it in Hindi, I may communicate it in Gujarati, I may communicate it in English or I may communicate it in any language in which I have an assurance that I will be understood. This is the whole discretion and criteria which I keep in my mind.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : मैं समझ नहीं पा
रहा हूँ कि आप क्या कह रहे हैं ?

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: It is known that I have been one of those who is a crusader for the introduction and development of regional languages as the media of instruction, as the media of administration and as the media of all our national affairs. So there is no question of my drifting away from what I have been crusading for last thirty years. In fact, that has been one of the most important issues on which I have to fight with my friends also. So, let us not bother about the language question here because then it would be bogging down the whole education policy into narrow orbits of the language issue only. After all, language is a means of communication and so long as we can

communicate, let us be open minded and work accordingly. If we have to communicate, and if we look at the vast masses of India who are illiterate and who are deprived of all the educational facilities, nobody can question that it can be done only through the regional languages or only through one of our national languages. But that is not the question which we are debating at the moment.

Now, what I was saying was that the educational policies that we have been framing from time to time have, more or less, a certain common core, a certain common basic agreement, like adult education, primary education, media of instruction, that education should be oriented more towards the needs of the community. All this is agreed upon. But the question is not what we agree upon but the question is how do we integrate all these into our educational system. The most difficult thing is that the system remains as it is. The Kothari Commission gave an excellent Report. I agree with Dr. Zakaria and I have been one who has been admiring this Report since its inception, but it has never been seriously attended to. Many of its vital recommendations on which there was a test of the change of the system were deferred for future. It is not a question of what we accept as desirable. We accept common schools as desirable, we accept medium of regional language as desirable, we accept adult education as desirable, we accept productive work as part of education as a very essential, desirable and good thing, but the test comes only when we have to integrate all these elements into our system. And I must say that in spite of all our efforts, whether of the previous Government or even this Government, we have not been able to make much headway about integrating these elements into our system. Our system has remained closed, rigid, unresponsive and is not yielding place to new ideas. In the system as a whole, there are good pockets, good islands, within the system everywhere.

My friend, Sarup Singhji and I whenever we met in the Vice-Chancellor's Conference, we accepted everything. We have always accepted that good and bad go together; we have always accepted coexistence of the evil system and the good system. Therefore, we do not give up any of the old components of the systems and we go on adding something. The result is that the question of changing the system remains where it is.

And it is here that the Education Minister has a very difficult and a very challenging and a very stupendous task, and I must say that he has started doing it very sincerely, very earnestly, since the day he took over. What was the first thing he came to say in this House? He brought to our notice the most important thing that we have been lacking in priorities in our educational policies. He was the first man who made a statement on the 5th of April in this House and said that the whole question of restructuring or renovating or transforming the whole system is a stupendous task, a very challenging task, which needs co-operation of everyone. No single party can do it; no single authority can do it. It is not a question of parties or only the Government or only the officers or only the bureaucracy or only the educational administrators or only the educational institutions; it will have to be a combined strength, a sum total of several factors combining together in a spirit of understanding and co-operation, which will bring a change in the educational system which we have been craving for, which we have been crying for.

Now, Sir, the point is that the new Education Minister started his conduct of educational policies with two major priorities. In his statement on the 5th of April, he said that the primary education shall receive the highest priority and that 50 per cent of the allocation on Education would be allocated to the primary education. And this is obvious. If you look to the statistics, what is happening? We want the primary education to be

[Prof. Ramlal Parikh]

made universally free for the duration of seven or eight years. Even if we want to complete it by 1985, what is required to be done? Today there are 65 million students in the primary schools. We will have to raise the number to 85 million. That is for classes 1 to 4. For classes 5 to 7 or 8, we will have to raise it from 15 million to 55 million. That means that we will need an addition of nearly 52 lakhs students every year. Only then we can achieve this target, we can achieve this objective, which has been prescribed in our Constitution as one of the Directive Principles making it obligatory on the State to implement this basic objective which we have not been able to achieve in one or the other way. But the Government has, I think, struck its attention very rightly on the core of the educational system, that is, the system of primary education is the basic system which has been neglected so far. In the last 30 years, what has been the average? If you look to the average, the average enrolment is not more than 24 lakhs. If we want to complete this programme by 1985, we need it to be more than doubled, it should be made 52 lakhs per year. In the last three or four years the neglect of primary education was so much that the average enrolment in the primary education declined from 24 lakhs to 11 lakhs. Now, this is a very alarming situation. And that is where we have to seek the co-operation of everyone, and make it an all-out effort, to see that we do not lag behind. Otherwise, the consequences are very clear and evident—that our illiteracy will go on increasing. In spite of whatever we may do—we may even spend Rs. 600 crores on adult education—our illiteracy cannot be wiped out if we do not resolve this issue of primary education. Therefore, I think this is a step in the right direction and this should form the first priority in our Education Policy. And the Government has been moving in the right direction. I was very much surprised when Dr. Zakaria said that the

Government has been moving aimlessly. How can you say that? Here is a Government which comes forth with a concrete programme with a concrete direction, of moving very rapidly to achieve the goal of universal primary education. I think nobody can dispute the Government's intentions. And here, it is not only a question of intentions, it is also an action-oriented concrete programme that has now been built up and which the Education Ministry and the Government of India are pursuing.

In the same way, the second priority was adult education. This also is a very serious and a very stupendous challenge which the new Education Minister has taken up. It is a stupendous because in five years' time we want to wipe out the illiteracy of nearly 10 crores of people. Working for wiping out literacy among a hundred million people is, I think, a staggering proposition. But the Government has taken up courage and said, "We will do it. We will find money for it. We will seek the co-operation of everyone, of all political parties, of all associations, voluntary agencies, State Governments, local bodies, everyone. Let everybody join in this national endeavour". This is again, to my mind, a very significant and important step taken in moulding the new Education Policy.

Before I go to the third point, mention was made about the 10+2 system and it was said that it was not necessary to enter into this statistical jugglery. It is not a statistical jugglery. In the name of ten-year schooling, the primary school system was totally submerged and subordinated and was practically being abolished. Therefore, this rectification that has been made recently by the Education Ministers' Conference is a right and correct rectification, without which the whole purpose of primary education, the basic obligation of the Constitution would have been forgotten. I was very happy when the Prime Minister suggested an 8+4 system. Some

people say that he was playing with statistics and that because there was a new Government, he wanted to change it. No. It was because even when the Kothari Commission had suggested this, many of us had said that this submerging of the primary education system, of seven or eight years, which has its own personality, its own objectives and which is universal, free and compulsory education, under secondary education in the name of 10-year schooling, was a disastrous proposition. It had to be changed. Irrespective of the fact whether this Government or that Government was in power, many of us would have continued to fight against the 10+2 pattern. It was not a question of whether the 10+2 pattern was right or wrong. Nobody questions the fact that we want reform and change in education. But this is a very good corrective that has now been accepted. And what was further suggested—which has not been accepted and for which I am going to continue the struggle—was that we are making too many layers and making our education too much hierarchical. After all, our society is so much ridden with hierarchy that we want to get out of it. But in education we are increasing hierarchy. It will lead us to the old feudal order if we do not correct it. Whether it is in terms of layers or in terms of cadres of teachers or in terms of positions in administration or anything, we must reduce hierarchy and the minimum. The Prime Minister has, therefore, suggested that let there be only three levels of education—primary, secondary and higher education. He never suggested that 12 years should be scrapped, that we should go back from 12 years to 11 years. He never said that. None of us ever said that. The Education Minister never said that. Instead of two years of secondary education and then another two years of higher secondary education and fragmenting education into units of one year, two years, three years, he said, let there be a four-year integrated course for those who want to

study further and for those who want to terminate at 10 years, let them also have an option to terminate. The National Educational Conference which was called by the late Shri Shriman Narayan came to the same conclusion that students should be allowed an option; those who want to study up to 12 they need not go to universities. I entirely agree with it, that we must stop this mad rush to universities and colleges. On that there is no difference of opinion....

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: The Kothari Commission never suggested that.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: I said, that is why why even the Kothari Commission's formula was defective and imperfect. That is what I said: in 10+2 even the Kothari Commission's formula was defective. But the Kothari Commission did suggest one thing which I do not think most of us remember, that +2 stage of 11 and 12 shall be a stage of secondary education as part of high school system, not be tagged as a corridor of the college. What has happened in the name +2? We have created more coming for entrance to universities and colleges. As a consequence, what we were hoping to achieve has been completely lost sight of. In course of time we should also have to integrate secondary and higher secondary education into one allowing numerous options, or electives in all courses. I do agree, let us not label anybody as vocational or non-vocational. This is the bane of our country. Gandhiji raised his voice long ago, since 1907 in his Hindi Swaraj. Nobody listened to it. In the world of education everybody paid a tribute to him but when it came to implementation, everybody developed cold feet; they began to run away. I have been in this educational world for a period of over 25 years working as a professor and a Vice-Chancellor. I have been attending their forums. I have seen how they began to stagger when the question of implementation, of in-

[Prof. Ramlal Parikh]

tegrating productive work into education, came. Therefore, it is a very hard and a very difficult problem which the new Government is facing and Adisheshaiah Committee. And the ment faced. I am not making any distinction on that account. But the Government here did make a breakthrough and appointed two committees immediately Isharbhay Committee and Adisheshaiah Committee. And the important thing that was brought out was "socially useful productive work" because we were doing some kind of a make-believe thing in the name of work experience which was a Western concept. This was never known to us. There may be an experience of productive work. There cannot be an experience of work. It was the most mischievous and fraudulent word the Kothari Commission used. I had told the Kothari Commission, if they wanted to use that word, work experience, they should have the courage to say that they do not believe in productive work. But they used a word in which they believed but they did not mean to do it. This is how our academicians, our educational experts, are going about in this matter, and I have to continuously fight against them and say that, this make-believe word will not do. They say this is an excellent thing and they would find some terminology or other under the cover of which they can escape the responsibility of implementing it. This Government has tried to pin down this issue and said, "socially useful productive work", "Not Work Experience", will be an integral part of education, primary education and secondary education. And to that extent it is in line with the modern educational thought. This whole mad rush of information load, considering education as mounting information, crushing the young minds under the load of information, to be given up. I, therefore, think that the Government is moving in right direction.

My fourth point is about the regional languages. It is equally true that our

education cannot be mass oriented, it cannot be consistent with our national interests, it cannot be in tune with our national life, community life and social life, until you gave all education including the medical and engineering education in our regional language. It is no use saying that you study in your regional language up to a point and when you go in for medical and engineering education you study in English. For that Dr. Zakaria will say: You make them learn English from the beginning. My suggestion is: You impart medical and engineering education also in the regional languages....

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: Where are the text books in regional languages?

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH. Text books have always followed introduction of languages the world over. Production of text books has never preceded introduction of a language. By now some generations have learnt in regional languages and they are far superior to others. When I say this, I speak from my personal experience. I am not quarrelling with my friend ... (Interruptions). I can substantiate what I said. For 25 years we have taught tribal students, Harijan students, rural students, urban students, middle class students and upper middle class students through their mother tongue. They are not lacking in anything. Lack of text-books have created no problem. Of course, I do not say this in order to minimise the importance of text-books. But do not try to create this fear of text-books and then try to put an obstruction in the progress of this very important programme. Without introduction of regional languages as medium of instruction, no country make its education people oriented. What type of education you want? Do you want some type of education just to serve a limited oligarchy of urban people? Or, do you want the education to serve the masses? If you want the latter one, then regional language is inescapable. In

1966 the Kothari Commission suggested that we should implement it within ten years. We did not even remember it. After ten years we say we will implement in the next five years. After five years, we will fix a limit of another five years. This is not the way to change our educational system. By making peripheral changes or placing patches here and there, we cannot transform an outdated system.

Coming to the question of policy, I also feel the time has come when our higher educational system should come to a halt. No more expansion should be allowed. Except in very genuine cases, it should be very difficult for anybody to open a college or expand it or proliferate irrelevant, traditional outdated departments in the name of this centre or that centre which does not have relations either with our local problems or even global problems. The whole world has been thinking afresh. In 1960 I was in Moscow and there I asked my Soviet friends: What is the key to your progress? They said: Our educational system. I had been to other western countries also. All of them attributed their progress to their educational system. None of them may say so now because they are also facing all these problems. All these people feel that the educational system basically has to change and we have no better solution than what Gandhiji had propounded or commended. Everybody is coming round to that view now. I do not say that everything that Gandhiji had said is right or it should be accepted. But the basic core of what Gandhiji had said has its applicability even now. You cannot have real education unless you undertake socially useful productive work. That alone will lend credibility to our educational system. My quarrel with the educational administrators here. In Gujarat we introduced productive work.

And, at the end of the examination, they said that the marks for the achievements or the performance of

the students was not going to be counted for working out the total for their career. I had a quarrel with them and I said, "Then, don't do this at all." You want to introduce socially useful productive work. But you are not counting it for career. I think that we should stop the expansion. Of these colleges. Fifty per cent of the colleges are nonviable colleges and they are without any substantial enrolment at all and they do not have any viable number and they do not have the minimum number which is required to run a college. Now, in this situation, to go on expanding the colleges is not good. Now, I was told that in Rajasthan, during the last three or four or six months, fifteen more colleges were added. I do not know whether it has come to the notice of the Education Minister. If that is so, it is something which must be looked into.

Now, Sir, the next point in the field of education or in the field of educational policy which the Government has adopted is the acceptance of diversity and no imposition in the name of a uniform policy. That also was something which we wanted.

Then, Sir, the next question that comes up is the question of the place of technology. Several people are creating some misunderstanding on this question also. Only a couple of weeks ago, we had a statement laid on the Table of the House showing the various schemes of rural technology or intermediate technology or appropriate technology, or whatever you may call it, being pursued in the various departments and institutions, in the various departments of the universities and in other scientific institutions. This is something which we need and when this is integrated into our educational system, you will find that everybody would have gainful work through his or her own skills.

Then, Sir, coming to the question of textbooks which has been referred to. I would say that I personally feel

[Prof. Ramlal Parikh]

that the Government should get out of this business. No government should publish textbooks on its own. It can recognise textbooks and it can say that textbooks of this standard and with these contents, with this kind of an educational aim may be accepted, and, Sir, when you have only one textbook, it becomes very dangerous thing even if the government does it. Let there be two or three or four textbooks in each subject and my own view is that the first step which we should take is to see that the government itself never undertakes the work of publishing. But it should certainly moderate them and it should certainly try to see them and evaluate them and it should also see that only appropriate types of textbooks which are consistent with our national goals, with the aims and objects prescribed in our constitution, are allowed and there is no doubt that if there is any textbook which undermines secularism which undermines socialism and which undermines democracy, we should not allow it. There is no doubt about it. But the point is that in the process of doing it, the Government also should not acquire the undue authority to do whatever it likes in the field of education. In this light, Sir, I would like to say, that some of the textbooks which were prescribed here by the NCERT were not good. On this there was some controversy also and I also thought in the beginning why there should be any controversy at all over this. But, when I read some of those books, particularly some books on history, I wondered how this kind of a material, this kind of a highly objectionable material, could go into the textbooks. University professors can write any number of books, but not school textbooks. Textbooks are meant to provide a certain commonly agreed material and are not to bring about any controversies or class controversies or any other type of conflicts. But I think the Ministry had no choice. But it can certainly go into certain textbooks where

some very objectionable things have been found and there is no harm if those objectionable things are corrected.

Now, Sir, there is one more question which I want to deal with. I shall now deal with the question of adult education. I had mentioned it earlier and I want to complete it now.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala):
How much time will he take?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is taking his party's time.

4 P.M.

[The vice-chairman, (Shri Shyam Lal Yadav), in the Chair].

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: We should not undertake it as a kind of war on illiteracy, not take it as a kind of normal administrative programme. I remember, Sir, that in the last thirty years the Government did its best but could not succeed. We have to approach voluntary agencies. I do not understand why you distrust them. Once the condition is made that no agency which is of communal character, which is against secularism, will be allowed to do this, or no political parties will be directly allowed to do this or undertake this work, this will certainly get support and strength. I feel that without involving voluntary agencies on a very large scale—not as a minor 5 per cent sector or 10 per cent sector, but 90 per cent voluntary sector and 10 per cent Government sector—only then adult education as a mass movement would be generated. And to that end, I think the Ministry deserves our congratulations that they have taken the right step. They should not be afraid of this criticism of involving voluntary agencies and pursue it unhindered and unfaltered. Without involving voluntary agencies neither rural development nor adult education will succeed. In my State, during the last thirty years, we hardly enrolled 300,000 adults—in thirty years—for the literacy programme. And in the last four months with the help of voluntary agencies, we have been able to enrol 2,50,000.

Sir, when the Government has declared that it has to be completed in five years, let us make a deadly effort, a determined effort, to fight it as a war, because if you delay it, more and more people will come into the fold of illiteracy, and we will come to a situation in which, I think, we will never be able to eradicate illiteracy in this country. Therefore, the time factor is very crucial. Nobody can go on giving it priority—to adult education, every time. I say, therefore, make it two or three years. For three or four years we concentrate on adult education. Within three years we want this to be wiped out. It is for completely overcoming, completely wiping out illiteracy that this adult education programme should be undertaken. And then, of course, it will have a great impact on planning, it will have a great impact on development, it will have a great impact on the quality and improvement of life of our people. There is no denying this fact. I need not go into details on this question.

Lastly, I am sorry, Sir, the subject is such a big one, education is such a comprehensive subject, and has such a wide dimension, that it is very hard to present one's views in a shorter time even if one really wanted to. The last thing that I would like to say is that the steps new, Government are taking in terms of forming a new educational policy, are welcome. But I would only say that the policies must be made, if at all, we are able to commit ourselves to something, and not just express desires. If we cannot commit ourselves to anything, let us not accept that. When we say we are committed to common schools, it means abolition of public schools. No compromise on that. It is better not to give lip service. If you believe in it, public schools must be brought in to the system without delay, and no fees should be charged for the first seven years. They must not be allowed to have any foreign language as a medium of instruction. They must teach in the mother tongue. Only then

they can form an integral part of our system of education. They must fall in line with the primary education system of the nation. This is for primary schools; I am not saying this about secondary schools. The acid test of this new policy which is in the process of being formulated, is how this common school pattern is established without delay, which means no difference between public schools and other schools. The idea of providing scholarships in public schools is notorious and obnoxious. It is an evil system which is not in tune with the national system, a system where no values, no goals and no aims of national education are being prescribed and you want the Government to spend, provide scholarships to study in these schools. We want to abolish the public school system. Here it is for the Government to decide and to make up its mind. (*Time Bell ring.*) I am sure that the Government will make up its mind.

The second test will be adult education, wiping out illiteracy in 5 years and not extending the programme beyond 5 years. With every day that is passing, we are losing something. Then the regional language as the media of examination in universities as well as public service commissions. Then stopping of expansion of colleges and de-linking degress from ordinary Government jobs except where specialised jobs are required like engineering and medicine. There are the acid test. If we can do something and if we can not sharpen our policies towards these things, the national policy will be hardly useful. I have every faith and confidence that our Education Minister, Dr. Pratap Chandra Chunder, who is a dedicated educationist, will spare no pains in getting these things done. He might have difficulties in persuading the State Governments. He might have difficulties in persuading the universities. I know that it is not easy. But his dedication, his sincerity and his endeavours would bring about these results and then you will see that India has a real

[Prof. Ramlal Parikh]

national educational policy. This is what we are striving for, what the Government is striving for and what all of us in this House who come from education irrespective of whether we belong to this group or that group, this party or that party are craving for. Let us all join our hands together in this noble endeavour.

SHRIMATI RAJINDER KAUR (Punjab): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister only to the centrally-run Higher Secondary Schools which are directly under his control. It is a fact that the educational standard of these schools is quite good, the discipline is well-maintained and the staff is always well trained. Only there are some drawbacks that at times the classes start and the books are not available. I can say that these schools are much better than the so-called public or convent schools. The only thing is that they need to be expanded to many more places. I find that all the Central Government employees are unable to get admission in the central schools. They are useful, but still there are certain shortcomings which are, of course, there in our educational pattern. They are not as much job oriented as they ought to be and even in primary classes and middle classes, the children have to learn too many subjects which are of no use absolutely to them in their later studies. That is why it is sometimes said that the difference between a student who passes the examination and a student who fails in the examination is only this much that the latter forgets what he has learnt before the examination and the former gets after the examination.

Sir, this is a lengthy topic and I do not wish to go into details. I will concern myself only with the central school curriculum. In the central school curriculum there is absolutely no provision whatsoever for teaching a regional language 5th class onwards, in the 6th, 7th and 8th classes,

the children have got no other option but only to learn Sanskrit. Under the three-language formula, three languages are to be taught. But only Sanskrit is being taught in the central schools. In three years in these schools, the children can only learn what verb, is to be used with what subject and what object. They can learn nothing more of Sanskrit within three years and one year therefore they forget whatever they have learnt.

Sir, I have got personal experience because all my children are in the Central School. My eldest child learnt Sanskrit and she got more than 85 per cent of marks in the final examination. If you now ask her anything about Sanskrit, she has entirely forgotten it. (*Time bell ring.*) Sir, I understand that it is very difficult to make a provision for all the regional languages in all the Central Schools because they are spread all over the country. But there can be a provision for the regional language of the region in which a particular school is located. For this there would not be any extra expenditure on the exchequer. If a school is located in Bengal, the Bengali teachers somehow manage to get posted in Calcutta or any other nearby place. If the Bengali is made the optional language in that area, the children can easily take up that. Therefore, I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister that if a school is located in a particular region and if a certain number of students opt for that regional language, then there should be a provision for teaching that language.

Sir, there is one thing which I want to say about the 10+2 system. There is great disparity between the college curriculum and the 10+2 curriculum. In the curriculum of the students who go to 10+2 and the students who go to the college. The student who goes to the 10+2 system has to study five subjects and the student who opts for the college has to study only four subjects. Sometimes the combination

is not advantageous to the students in his latter studies. A non-medical student has to take biology as an additional subject or one other language as an elective subject. In the same way, a medical student has to take mathematics. For a medical student, mathematics is of no use in his later studies, and in the same way biology is not of any use for a non-medical student.

Sir, I know the aspirations of every Member of this House about the regional languages. Therefore, I suggest that there should be a provision for the regional languages in these schemes. Then, Sir, we should not consider Urdu as a foreign language. It is as much known to the people here as outside. And there may be a provision for Urdu also to be a second language. Previously, we used to have Persian, Sanskrit and other languages and one had to opt for one language out of them. Sir, Urdu is spoken at the all-India level. Why should not the students be provided an opportunity to study that also? For the regional language also, there should be some provision. Thank you, Sir.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा (बिहार) : मान्यवर, किसी भी देश की शिक्षा पद्धति उस देश के राष्ट्रीय उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति की साधक होती है। दुर्भाग्यवश हमारे देश में जो शिक्षा पद्धति रही है और खास कर पिछले 16 महीनों में उस को जिस तरह से कार्यान्वित किया गया है उस से हम इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचते हैं कि हमारे देश की शिक्षा पद्धति हमारे राष्ट्रीय उद्देश्यों की साधक नहीं, बल्कि उन में बाधक है।

श्रीमान्, हमारा राष्ट्रीय उद्देश्य क्या है? हमने अपने संविधान में कहा है—धर्म-निरपेक्षता, जनतंत्र और समाजवाद। क्या हमारी शिक्षा-पद्धति इन राष्ट्रीय उद्देश्यों को सिद्ध करने में सहायक हुई है? हमने

अपने संविधान में कहा था कि दस साल के भीतर 14 वर्ष तक की उम्र के तमाम बच्चों को हम निःशुल्क और अनिवार्य शिक्षा देंगे। 31 साल बीत गए हम उस उद्देश्य तक नहीं पहुंच सके। 31 साल बीत गए लेकिन हमारे देश में अभी भी 70 फीसदी लोग अनपढ़ हैं, अशिक्षित हैं। ये 70 फीसदी लोग कौन हैं? ये हमारे देश के सबसे गरीब लोग हैं। तो हमारे देश की जो शिक्षा पद्धति है वह गरीबों के लिए नहीं है, वह अमीरों के लिए है। वह अमीरों के विशेषाधिकारों की रक्षा की शिक्षा पद्धति है और यही कारण है कि हम एक ओर देखते हैं कि तथाकथित पब्लिक स्कूल हैं जहां फी बच्चे पर 5-5 सौ रुपये खर्च किए जाते हैं और दूसरी तरफ ऐसे भी स्कूल हैं जहां पर फी बच्चे 5 रुपये भी खर्च नहीं किए जाते हैं।

मान्यवर, हमें इस सम्बन्ध में दूसरे तर्कों में जाने के बजाय डा० गुनार मिडल को उद्धृत करना चाहते हैं जिन्होंने विकसित देशों की समस्याओं का विशेष अध्ययन किया है, उन्होंने शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में बहुत ही सटीक बात कही है। विकासशील देशों में शिक्षा पद्धति में क्या दोष है? श्रीमान्, मैं उससे उद्धरण देना चाहूंगा—

“The shortcomings in the educational system are manifold as you will come to touch upon. At bottom, the main cause besides poverty why they should have persisted, is the selfishness of this upper strata who hold power in these countries and do it rather independently of their constitutions. They have not been prepared to take the consequences of the goal to reach greater equality which they commonly pronounce. Instead, they have been bent on perpetuating educational systems that preserve their traditional privileges.”

यह हमारी शिक्षा पद्धति का सबसे बड़ा दोष है। यह दोष और भी जोरदार हो गया पिछले 16 महीनों में। हम जब

[श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा]

कहते हैं कि पिछले 16 महीनों में जोरदार हो गई है तो आज हम देश पर नजर डालते हैं और देखते हैं कि जितनी भी सेंट्रल युनिवर्सिटीज हैं, जितने भी केन्द्रीय विश्वविद्यालय हैं, सीधे केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधीन चलने वाले विश्वविद्यालय है वे आज अग्रान्ति, असन्तोष और आन्दोलन के क्षेत्र बन गये हैं। अनेकों विद्यालय और अनेकों विश्वविद्यालय आज आन्दोलन के क्षेत्र बने हुए हैं। वे बन्द पड़े हुए हैं। वहां परीक्षाएँ नहीं हो रही है।

इतना ही नहीं, यदि इतनी ही बात होती तो ज्यादा चिंता नहीं होती। दो-चार दिन पहले हमारे दल के नेता कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त ने कहा था कि मकार्थीवाद का दौर-दौरा चल रहा है। हमारे लिये सबसे बड़ी चिंता की बात है। मैं समझता हूँ इस देश के तमाम देशभक्तों के लिये, तमाम जनतंत्रवादियों के लिये सबसे बड़ी चिंता की बात होती चाहिये यदि हमारी शिक्षा संस्थाओं में, हमारी शिक्षा पद्धति पर मकार्थीवाद का, साम्प्रदायवाद का न दौर-दौरा चलना है। मेरा निवेदन है कि ऐसा हो रहा है। इस सिलसिले में दो-चार प्रमाण देकर अपनी बात खत्म करूंगा।

अभी-अभी हमारे पूर्ववक्ता महोदय ने, श्रीख साहब चले गये, उन्होंने 'एनसिएंट इंडिया' नामक पुस्तक, जिसको डा० राम शरण शर्मा ने लिखा है, की चर्चा की। उन्होंने कहा कि इस पुस्तक को पढ़ कर उन्हें कई विवादास्पद बात मिली हैं। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपने डा० राम शरण शर्मा, रोमिला थापर, हर्बंस मुखिया, विपिन चन्द्र, वरुण दे आदि—विद्वानों की किताबों की सिलेबस से निहाल कर बाहर फेंक दिया है तो बाहर फेंकने का क्या कारण है।

डा० प्रताप चन्द्र चन्द्र : यह सही नहीं है।

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : जवाब दीजिएगा। हमें ता अखबारों में पढ़ा है। हम आपकी तरह प्रोफेसर नहीं हैं, विद्वान नहीं हैं और न ही सरकार की ओर से कोई खंडन हुआ है—आप खंडन कर दीजिएगा बड़ी खुशी होगी।

मैं कह रहा था कि क्या कोई विशेषज्ञ समिति की बैठक जांच करने के लिये बुलाई गई। मैं समझता हूँ कोई नहीं बुलाई गई।

मान्यवर, आप जानते हैं कि इस देश में इतिहासज्ञों का सबसे बड़ा संगठन 'इंडियन हिस्ट्री कांग्रेस' है। इस देश के इतिहासज्ञों के प्रतिनिधियों के इस संगठन ने किताबों के निकाले जाने के खिलाफ प्रस्ताव पास किया है। लेकिन हमारी सरकार ने क्या किया? हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री ने क्या किया? क्योंकि हिस्ट्री कांग्रेस ने ऐसा किया इसलिए 'हिस्ट्री कांग्रेस' को विभक्त करने के लिये, उसमें फूट डालने के लिये दूसरी संस्था खड़ी कर दी। सरकार है, सरकार के पास साधन हैं, साधनों की कमी नहीं है इसलिए एक दूसरी संस्था खड़ी कर दी और इस संस्था का सभापतित्व करने के लिये कोई माने-जाने विद्वान को नहीं बुलाया गया बल्कि एक आनन्दमार्गी को लाया गया अध्याक्षता करने के लिये और खुद शिक्षा मंत्री कैबिनेट मीटिंग से उठ कर वहां पर भाषण देने के लिये गये। शर्म की बात है।

मान्यवर, डा० राम शरण शर्मा न केवल इस देश में माने-जाने इतिहासज्ञ हैं बल्कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय ख्याति के इतिहासज्ञ हैं, जिनको प्राचीन भारत के इतिहास पर भाषण देने के लिये युनाइटेड किंगडम, अमेरिका, एशिया, और दूसरे देशों से निमंत्रण आते हैं। वह वहां भाषण करने जाते रहे हैं। कलकत्ता युनिवर्सिटी ने भी उन्हें 'एनसिएंट इंडिया' पर भाषण देने के लिये बुलाया था। वहां उन्होंने भाषण दिये उनको 'प्यूडिलिज्म इन इंडिया' नामक पुस्तक के

रूप में प्रकाशित किया गया है। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय ख्याति का ऐसा विद्वान देश के लिये शर्व और गौरव की बात है। लेकिन आप लोग ऐसे आदमी को डेलीगेशन में भी जाने से रोकते हैं। और वह डेलीगेशन क्या था, इस बात को भी देखने की जरूरत है। मध्य एशिया से जो माइग्रेशन हुआ है, उस पर विचार करने के लिए एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सेमिनार हो रहा था। उसमें हिस्ट्री के एक ऐसे विद्वान का जो न केवल राष्ट्रीय ख्याति का विद्वान है बल्कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय ख्याति का विद्वान है, और जो प्राचीन इतिहास का प्रकाण्ड विद्वान है, उसको उस सेमिनार में भाग लेने से रोक दिया गया। उसका क्या कसूर था, क्या अपराध था? उसका अपराध यह था कि वह सम्प्रदायवादी नहीं है और उसने भारत के प्राचीन इतिहास को वैज्ञानिक ढंग से समझने और लिखने की कोशिश की है। उसके अन्दर हिन्दुवाद की बू तक नहीं है, यही उसका कसूर था।

श्री पी० राममूर्ति (तमिलनाडु) : इसके लिए क्या वहाना बनाया गया ?

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : वहाना क्या हो सकता है, इसके तो आप खुद ही भुक्तभोगी रहे हैं मान्यवर, सरकार को तरफ से कहा जाता है कि उनमें त्रुटियां थीं। त्रुटियां निकालने के लिए कोई विशेषज्ञ कमेटी नहीं बैठ गई। इंडियन हिस्ट्री कांग्रेस ने उनकी किताब का समर्थन किया। मैं सरकार ने यह पृष्ठना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वह सही मायनों में वैज्ञानिक ढंग में इतिहास को लिखना चाहती है तो क्या हमारे मंत्री महोदय इस बात को इन्कार करने के लिए तैयार हैं कि हमारे प्राचीन भारत में कुछ बुराइयां ऐसी थीं जिनको हटाना चाहिये और जिन के लिए हमको गर्म भी आती है? क्या वे यह बात मानने के लिए तैयार हैं कि हमारे सनातन में जाति-पाति और सम्प्रदायवाद की कुछ इस प्रकार की बुराइयां थीं जिनके कारण आज भी हमारा

देश बाहि-बाहि कर रहा है? इसलिदे आज जरूरत इस चीज की है कि हमारे समाज में जो बुराइयां आ गई थीं उनको समाज से निकाल दिया जाय और वैज्ञानिक दृष्टिकोण से इतिहास को लिखा जाय।

डा० प्रताप चन्द्र चन्द्र : क्या आपने उनको यह किताब पढ़ी है ?

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : जी हां, मैंने पढ़ी है। उस किताब की तमाम बातों का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप उस किताब पर एक सेमिनार कीजिये और उसमें विद्यार्थियों और विशेषज्ञों को बुलाइये। आपने बिना सोच विचार किये उस किताब को शिक्षा जगत से निकाल दिया। एक तरफ तो आप लोग शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में ओटोनोमी की बात करते हैं, जनतंत्र की बात करते हैं, दूसरी तरफ आपकी इस प्रकार की कार्यवाहियां होती हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जनतंत्र का नाम और शिक्षा क्षेत्र की ओटोनोमी एक प्रकार का ढकोसला और पाखण्ड है।

श्रीमन् मैं आपके सामने एक उदाहरण रखना चाहता हूँ। एक डा० बी० सी० चाधरी बिहार के अन्दर जायसवाल शोध संस्थान में काम करते थे। अभी अभी उनको निकाल दिया गया है। उन्हें क्यों निकाल दिया गया और उनका क्या कसूर था, इसको भी देखने की जरूरत है। अभी थोड़े दिन पहले कटक के अन्दर एक हिस्ट्री कांग्रेस हुई जिसमें सम्प्रदायवाद के खिलाफ अवाज उठी थी। उस अवाज में डा० चौधरी ने भी अपनी अवाज मिलाई। यही उस विद्वान का कसूर था और इसी कसूर के लिए उसको निकाल दिया गया। इस कार्यवाही के खिलाफ पूरे बिहार के शिक्षा वर्ग में और विद्वानों के समुदाय में व्यापक असंतोष फैला हुआ है और खलबली मची हुई है। आप लोग जनतंत्र ओटोनोमी की बात करते हैं, लेकिन आप

[श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा]

सम्प्रदायवाद का जो जहर फैला रहे हैं उसमें ये विद्वान् आपका साथ देना नहीं चाहते हैं। तो उनको निकाल बाहर कर देते हैं। इसी प्रकार से दिल्ली के राजधानी कालेज के इतिहास विभाग में एक शिक्षक हैं श्री जे० एन० सिंह अब उनको भी निकालने की साजिश चल रही है।

क्यों साजिश चल रही है ? इसलिए कि उसने कहा मैं अपना वैज्ञानिक दृष्टिकोण छोड़ने नहीं जा रहा हूँ चाहे इसके लिए हमें प्राणों की बलि चढ़ानी पड़े। हम सम्प्रदायवाद के सामने नहीं झुकने जा रहे हैं उससे हम समझौता नहीं करेंगे। यह है सरकार का मक़ाथीवाद, जिसको अंग्रेजी में भूषेण जी ने विच हंट कहा। मान्यवर हमारा देश बहुत बड़ा है, महान देश है। हम घड़ी देख रहे हैं और आप भी परेशान होंगे इसलिए हम इधर-उधर भागना नहीं चाहते हैं, दिल्ली में ही रहना चाहते हैं ? दिल्ली के 14 कालेजों में असंतोष है। डा० बी० पी० दत्त नहीं बोले हमें आशा है कि वे बोलेंगे क्योंकि शिक्षा तो उनका विषय है। दिल्ली के 14 कालेजों की गवर्निंग कमेटियों को बदल दिया गया। आपकी सरकार ने बदल दिया। आपने बदल दिया। यह जिम्मेदारी आपकी है। क्यों बदल दिया ? इसलिए कि आर० एस० एस० के मातहत गवर्निंग कमेटियों का पुनर्गठन किया जाए और 14 कालेजों में जो नयी कमेटियाँ बनाई गई वहाँ पर आर० एस० एस० के लोगों को अध्यक्ष बनाया गया। ऐसे लोग अध्यक्ष बनाए गए कि जिनमें से कुछ मेट्रिक पास भी नहीं। यह है आपका शिक्षा के प्रति प्रेम। (Interruptions).

श्री प्रेम मनोहर : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : शर्मा जी आर० एस० एस० के नाम से क्यों परेशान हो रहे हैं। आर० एस० एस० का नाम क्यों ले रहे हैं

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : मान्यवर यह हम लोगों की पारस्परिक परेशानी है . . .

मान्यवर, हम जे० एन० यू० के बारे में नहीं बोलना चाहते। हमारे माननीय मित्र श्री राममूर्ति जी इस पर बोलेंगे। लेकिन हम हम यह कहे बिना नहीं रह सकते हैं कि आज जे० एन० यू० के विशेष चरित्र को बदलने के लिए साजिश चल रही है और यह चल रही है तमाम वैधानिक और तमाम विधि की संगतियों को तोड़ कर। हम इसकी डिटेल में नहीं जाना चाहते। कमरेड राममूर्ति विस्तार में इस पर बोलेंगे।

एक शब्द अक्सर सुनाई देता है —कैम्पस वायलेंस, कैम्पस अनरेस्ट का सवाल उठाया जाता है। हम जनबुझ कर विश्व विद्यालय परिषद् हिन्दी में नहीं कह रहे हैं ताकि अधिक से अधिक लोगों की समझ में आवे। यूनी-वर्सिटी अनरेस्ट यूनीवर्सिटी कैम्पस में क्यों हो रहा है ? इसको यह ला एंड आर्डर का सवाल बताना चाहते हैं। पंतनगर कृषि विश्वविद्यालय में वाइस चांसलर ने जो हरकत की जो जुल्म किए वे जलियाँवाला बाग जैसे जुल्म थे। जब इस तरह की चीजे होती हैं फिर शिक्षा संस्थाओं में शान्ति कैसे रह सकती है ; शिक्षा संस्थाओं में शिक्षा के मन्दिरों में आज असंतोष है, आन्दोलन है इसलिए आज हमारे देश की आर्थिक और समाजिक व्यवस्था में विषमता बढ़ती जा रही है और इस विषमता को बढ़ाने में इस शिक्षा पद्धति ने भी योगदान दिया है। यदि मंहगाई बढ़ेगी, बेकारी बढ़ेगी, जिस देश में ढाई करोड़ आदमी बेकार होंगे जिस देश में 60 लाख शिक्षित बेकार रहेंगे उस देश के विश्वविद्यालय में कैसे शान्ति और संतोष रह सकता है ? ।

आज भी वहाँ अशांति है, असंतोष है उसका मूल कारण देश की आर्थिक और समाजिक व्यवस्थाओं में जो बुराइयाँ हैं, वे हैं। हमें उनको दूर करना है और उसके अनुरूप ही शिक्षा को बदलना है।

हमारे बिहार में, मान्यवर, विद्यार्थी लोग कहते हैं कि नहीं साहब, हम चोरी से उत्तर लिखेंगे, परीक्षा में। उन्होंने नारा बना दिया

है 'सरकार बनी है चोरी से हम पास करेंगे चोरी से' कोई भी आदमी इसका समर्थन नहीं नहीं कर सकता है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : क्या ?

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : "सरकार बनी है चोरी से हम पास करेंगे चोरी से"। कोई भी इसका समर्थन नहीं कर सकता है। लेकिन एक वैज्ञानिक की हैसियत से, एक समाज शास्त्री की हैसियत से, वस्तुगत रूप से हमको देखना पड़ेगा, समझना पड़ेगा कि वही नौजवान जिसने सम्पूर्ण क्रान्ति के नाम पर अपने कंधों पर चढ़ाकर आपको बिठाया राज गद्दी पर आज वह क्यों यह नारा लगा रहा है ? वह इसलिए नारा लगा रहा है कि उनकी तमाम आशाओं पर तुषारापात हो गया है। जिसको उन्होंने सम्पूर्ण क्रान्ति समझा था, वह देखना है कि आज वह सम्पूर्ण भ्रान्ति हो गयी है। वह अपने को ठगा सा महसूस करता है और इतना ही नहीं। जिनको उसने समझा था कि ये समग्र क्रान्ति के नेता बनेंगे — हमारे विहार के मंत्री खुलेआम पब्लिकली कहते हैं हमारे डाक्टर, राम कृपाल जी माथे पर हाथ रखकर रो तो नहीं रहे हैं ?

श्रम तथा संवदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (डा० राम कृपाल सिंह) : सुन रहा हूँ।

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : सुन रहे हैं वह खुलेआम, पब्लिकली कहते हैं कि हम गुडे रखते हैं, हम गुडे पालते हैं क्योंकि चुनाव जीतने के लिए गुडे पालने जरूरी हैं और जब ऐसे लोग उन विद्यार्थियों का इस्तेमाल वृथ्वा कैचरिंग के लिए करेंगे तो उसके बाद अगर वे यह कहते हैं कि सरकार बनी है चोरी से, हम पास करेंगे चोरी से, हम नकल करेंगे हम किताब को लेकर प्रश्नोत्तर देंगे तो इसके लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है ? इसके लिए हम और आप जिम्मेदार हैं। उनकी जिम्मेदार बनाना

अपनी जिम्मेदारी से भागना है, अपने दोषों पर पर पर्दा डालना है।

प्रौढ़ शिक्षा के नाम पर बहुत सी नयी स्कीमें बनायी गयी है। हम विद्वानों लोकेश के कहने से पूर्ण सहमत हैं कि आप प्रौढ़ शिक्षा समस्या नहीं हल करने जा रहे हैं बल्कि आप अर० एस० एस० का संगठन गांव में गांव सरकारी सहायता और सरकारी मर्यादा के आधार पर स्थापित करने में मदद करने जा रहे हैं जहां पर कि वह कमजोर था। यह इनका उद्देश्य है और इस तरह से आप पूरी शिक्षा में सम्प्रदायवाद का जहर घोल रहे हैं। इन बातों को देखने के बाद हम बहुत परेशान थे कि हमारे इतने विद्यवान शिक्षा मंत्री जिन्होंने बहुत सी किताबों लिखी हैं, ऐसे शिक्षा मंत्रियों के रहते हुए कैसे ये बातें हो रही हैं तो मैंने इनकी किताबों को पढ़ना शुरू कर दिया (मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ) इनकी किताबों को पढ़ना शुरू कर दिया। इनकी एक किताब जो बंगाली में लिखी गयी है और उसका हिन्दी अनुवाद हुआ है उसको हमने पढ़ा है, "जाब चारणोखर की बीबी चारणोखर की पत्नी, उस किताब को पढ़ने के बाद हमें विश्वास नहीं होता कि ये किताब डाक्टर चुन्दर जैसे व्यक्ति लिख सकते हैं। क्योंकि उस किताब में लिखा है कि ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी के आफिसर पटना और पटना के आस पास, वहां की दुखी, शोषित पीड़ित जनता को मुस्लिम शासकों के उपद्रवों से और अत्याचारों से रक्षा करने के लिए गये और उनकी भूमिका उसी तरह की थी जिस तरह की भूमिका पश्चिम में शिवाजी अदा किया करते थे।

यह हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री श्री पी० सी० चन्द्र ने लिखा है उसमें विश्वास नहीं होता था कि इस तरह की बात यह लिख सकते हैं।

श्री कलपनाथ राय : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, डा० रफीक जकरिया स हव ने कहा कि I praise the secular Chief Ministership. Now I ask what is your opinion?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please conclude.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): I would like to tell only one thing to my friend. After all, it is a good novel and is worth reading. He should not be so critical the whole country rose.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : हम खत्म कर रह है आखिर में केवल इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। Therefore, I read and I am surprised and shocked how such things could be written by learned Dr. P. C. Chunder praising the East India Co. as a liberator of India against whom the whole country rose.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I do not think, Sir, it is wrongly interpreted. I would like to place on record that the book is worth reading.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई भी भी पैट्रियाटिक इण्डियन, कोई भी देश भक्त ईस्ट इण्डिया कम्पनी का समर्थक नहीं हो सकता और कोई यह नहीं कह सकता कि वह हिन्दुस्तान में लिब्रेटर हो कर आई। स्लेवरी करने वाले को लिटर कहना यह देश भक्ति नहीं, देशभक्ति के साथ गद्दारी है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If it is so, Sir, on the basis of the friend's disclosures in the House I say that this book should be withdrawn. I request you to withdraw this book.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA: Fortunately, that is not in the syllabus.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: You have never read a novel in your life. Why are you interested in it? He has never read a novel in his life.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: It is a very good publicity for my book.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। आखिर में मेरे दो-तीन सुझाव हैं। मंत्री महोदय से मेरा पहला सुझाव यह है कि शिक्षा संस्थाओं से मैकार्थीवाद और सम्प्रदायवाद को दूर करो। उनकी स्वायत्तता और जन-तांत्रिक प्रबंध की गारण्टी करो। बिहार में मान्वर विश्वविद्यालय का वाइस-लान्सलर कमिशनर बनाये जा रहे हैं। कमिशनर के मातहत विश्वविद्यालय किए जा रहे हैं और यहां आटोनामी की बात करते हैं।

दूसरी बात शिक्षा को रोजगारमुखी बनाएं।

तीसरी बात, शिक्षा की पद्धति ऐसी होनी चाहिए जिसका मोटो हो पढ़ो और पढ़ाओ पढ़ो और काम करो, काम करो और पढ़ो। प्रौढ़ शिक्षा के लिए साल में तीन महीने यह जो 60 लाख शिक्षित बेकार है और न पता नहीं कितने लाख शिक्षक हैं.....

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : एक करोड़

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : तो इन एक करोड़, तमाम लोगों को तीन महीने इस आन्दोलन में लगा दीजिए यदि आप सचमुच में प्रौढ़ शिक्षा करना चाहते हैं और इस देश के 70 प्रतिशत लोगों को अशिक्षा के क्लंक से मुक्त करना चाहते हैं।

आखिर में मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि हमारा जो यह बहु-भाषी देश है, अनेक धर्मों को मानने वाला देश है वहां पर त्रिभाषी फार्मूला, जिसे श्री-लक्ष्मण फार्मूला कहते हैं अनिवार्य है। यदि देश की एकता हमें कायम रखनी है तो इससे बचना असम्भव है। मातृभाषा में ऊंची से ऊंची शिक्षा होनी चाहिए लेकिन साथ ही साथ सैकण्ड्री स्टेज में या द्वितीय स्टेज में यह तीनों भाषाएं, त्रिभाषी फार्मूला लागू करना चाहिए। खास करके हिन्दी क्षेत्र में, कितने हिन्दी क्षेत्रों के राज्यों ने इसको टाल दिया। और मैं डा० जकरीया के इस सजेशन को सपोर्ट करूंगा कि इस पूरे हिन्दी

बेन्ट में त्रि-भाषी फार्मूले में एक भाषा उर्दू अवश्य होनी चाहिए। इस से देश के इन्टीग्रेशन में बहुत बड़ी सहायता होगी।

डा० प्रताप चन्द्र चन्द्र : साऊथ इंडियन लैंग्वेज में से नहीं ?

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : हम समझते हैं उर्दू होनी चाहिए इस से इन्टीग्रेशन में सहायता होनी चाहिए।

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER:
No South Indian language?

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY
(Andhra Pradesh): It should be in Telugu.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : : तो फिर उर्दू मर जाएगी।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please conclude now.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : : तीसरी चीज आखीर में ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY:
Should be Telugu.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : तीसरी चीज यह है कि हिन्दी की पर नहीं लादनी चाहिए। परन्तु साथ ही साथ अंग्रेजी भी नहीं लादनी चाहिए। यह जो ऐतिहासिक लाभ है हमारे देश में अंग्रेजी का, उस से देश को मुक्त करना चाहिए। हम किसी भाषा के विरोधी नहीं हैं परन्तु नए देश को बनाना है तो उस नए देश के अनुरूप हमारी भाषा नीति भी होनी चाहिए।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

*SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I welcome the debate on

*English translation of the speech delivered in Tamil.

educational policy and I take this opportunity to express my views here.

Before our country become free, the percentage of literate Indians was only 15 per cent. Now, it has increased, it is stated, upto 40 per cent it seems that the census has included even those persons who know only how to sign in their mother-tongue. Our country is not, I regret to note, similar to America, wherein the literate persons constitute more than 90 per cent or to England wherein the percentage of literate persons is more than 88. It cannot stand equal to the Communist Countries, wherein the literacy has grown up more than 90 per cent.

We will have to think seriously as to how the literacy has to be spread equivalent to other countries in the West. I think, it may take even one hundred years more, if we follow the present state of affairs. It is a very much regrettable position.

When the Education was in the State—list and the States were allotting 30 per cent of their funds towards Education, the literacy was very low. When it is included, now, in the concurrent list, then also, we find, the progress is not upto the mark. And hence it seems that the Central Government is reviewing the policy and going to include it in the State—list again in the interest of education we feel that only one Educational policy is not at all suited to this country, because it has many languages, many cultures. India means "Unity in diversity."

In Switzerland, wherein the total population is more than 6.5 million, there are 25 educational policies in their different units. Even in Britain, there are many educational policies. If we follow those examples and permit the State Government to have their own educational policies. I feel, there is every possibility in the growth of literacy. So far as our Tamil Nadu is concerned, we are deeply interested in the 10+2, because it has an opportunity to learn 36 types of

[Shri E. R. Krishnan]
 technical education. Our Hon'ble Minister Shri Chunder has also appreciated our Government's effort in the progress of technical education, but some conservatives do not have faith in the 10+2. There is every opportunity in the 10+2 system to learn nursing, dentistry, fertilizers etc. The conservatives are interested only in History and Geography etc.

If we follow the 10+2 system and achieve the desired progress, there will be every possibility of getting employed in the technical fields for the graduates. The 10+2 system will also prevent the unemployment problem, which has increased because we followed so far only the old and conservative type of education. If this 10+2 system is to be pursued sincerely, the Central Government should increase the grant to our State Government. In regard to the Adult Education programme, I may point out here, some persons dupe the unemployment graduates with the promise of job and take bribe, say Rs. 5,000 to 6,000 in our Tamil Nadu. I request the Minister to take adequate and precautionary measures to prevent such mal-practices. So far as the Three-language formula is concerned, this House is aware of, our Tamil Nadu is dead against it. We are very successful in our two-language formula for the last ten years. Wherever the three-language formula is followed, I find, only Sanskrit or Urdu is studied as a Third Language. May I ask the Hon'ble Minister, is there any Hindi speaking State where in any South Indian language is taught as a third-language? That is the main reason that we had rejected the three-language formula and pursued the two-language formula. I may also point out on this occasion that no serious efforts were taken in teaching South Indian languages in the Kendriya Vidyalayas located in the Hindi speaking States. It is also very much regretted to note that no lessons depicting the Dravidian culture and the progress our Tamil Nadu were included in the books

brought out by the NCERT.

I protest strongly on the efforts taken to teach Hindi compulsorily in the Central Government Offices, it has caused unnecessary embarrassment to all the non-Hindi speaking employees.

When the resolution favouring Hindi as the Official Language was adopted in the Constituent Assembly in the year 1949, the voting was evenly given i.e. 128 votes in favour and 128 votes against. Because of the casting vote of the President of the Assembly, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Hindi was given the position as the Official Language. It is, therefore, crystal-clear that Hindi was not at all given the position, Sir, as the official language with the majority of votes, as it was often stated. It is also said now and then. That Hindi is the language of the majority of Indians. We know that the crow is seen everywhere in India; that does not mean that it should be acclaimed as the National bird, but we have given that credit to the peacock, although it is not seen every where, due to its beauty and charm. When we take all the States into account, we find only the four States, i.e. Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh—where in Hindi is spoken by the majority of people. In Haryana, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh Hindi is understood. Even we take those three States also into account, we find that Hindi is not at all spoken in the majority of States. Then, how can you claim that Hindi is the language of majority of Indians? This type of confusion created now and then, I regret to point out, mars the progress of education in our country; even after 31 years of our independence our literacy did not exceed more than 40 per cent.

We go to foreign countries, visit the U.N.A., but we feel ashamed of in quoting our percentage of literacy, whenever any foreigner asks about it. It is, therefore, not at all a civilised claim that Hindi is our language and spoken by the majority here. Please do not impose Hindi compulsorily, it

would, definitely, stand in the way of our national integration. Let every State-Government take steps to teach the regional language. English should be continued as our Inter-State language. We have no objection for teaching Hindi in the Hindi speaking States, but it is not justifiable to impose Hindi on the non-Hindi speaking States. Even Mahatma Gandhi did not advocate Hindi as our official language, he was in favour of Hindustani commonly understood. On this occasion, may I request, Sir, for taking sincere efforts, atleast within the ensuing 10 to 15 years for propagation of the regional languages?

No efforts should be taken to impose Hindi upon us and treat as second-class citizens in India. I welcome once again the 10+2 system and request the Hon'ble Minister for allocation of more funds to our State Government. Thank you.

5.00 P.M.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, time and again I have participated in the discussions on the Education Policy. In fact, for the last six years I have been taking part in these discussions. Sometimes I have even initiated discussions on the Education Policy. In fact, I was wondering today whether I should speak at all. I have seen Governments come and go, Education Ministers come and go. All of us come and go, but the educational system remains where it was.

Sir, when my friend, Mr. Ramlal Parikh spoke, I was almost tempted to bring back those reports, proceedings, to show how I have year after year pointed out some of the fundamental problems. I have pointed out that the primary, most vital, most urgent, central, task in India is to remove illiteracy. The new phrase that is being used is universalisation of primary education. To my mind, removal of illiteracy goes beyond that. Therefore, I still use the word 'illiteracy'. I say, the most vital problem facing the country is to re-

move illiteracy from this country, to bring some knowledge and light where there has been darkness before. I have been pointing out that education should be related to labour and work, that learning should not be divorced from life, that there should be an intimate relationship between learning, labour and productivity, also that education should be related to environment. I have said before, some two or three years ago, that we have our own lakes and ponds and our own flora and fauna, our own natural environment and we must bring our education, our school education, in alignment with this natural environment, that the educational system should enable us to face the challenges of life, should essentially make us independent human beings, able to think for ourselves, able to solve the problems, and that in order to achieve that the most urgent need is to spread the spirit of science, to inculcate the scientific spirit. Also I have pointed out year after year that our educational priorities were distorted, that the rate of growth in our educational sectors was in inverse proportion to the needs of the country, that the rate of growth of secondary education was higher than the rate of growth of primary education, that the rate of growth of higher secondary education was higher than the rate of growth of secondary education, that the rate of growth of under-graduate education was higher than that of higher secondary education, that the rate of growth of higher education—post-graduate education—was higher than that of under-graduate education—I am talking of the rate of growth—and that the rate of growth of the highest education—post post-graduate education, Ph. D. and so on—was higher than that of higher education, and that this is a distorted kind of priority for a country like ours, also that 75 per cent of our children drop out before they reached the 9th class. I have also said again and again in this House that the entire infrastructure of education, the complex of education, the industry, the related development should be

[Dr. V. P. Dutt]

taken to the villages of India and be made relevant there because that is where India really is. I have also mentioned and I am repeating it to-day, because these are the fundamental problems, that the rate of growth in education has no relationship with the rate of economic growth in the country. We have had 10 per cent rate of growth in education, virtually speaking, since independence whereas the rate of economic growth has only been 3.5 per cent. Today the Government says that the rate of growth is 7 per cent. But one of the most important members of the Planning Commission, Mr. Raj Krishna, has said publicly that this target is entirely unreal. Unless we bring the rate of growth in education in alignment with the rate of economic growth, I do not know how we are going to solve our problem with our education.

I have also been pleading in this House for delinking jobs from educational qualifications. I moved a resolution here some four years ago. In that private Member's resolution I had said that qualifications for jobs should be functional and that you should not require a B.A. degree for every little job you have in the country. If you require that qualification for any job, you should enable everybody to get that degree. In that resolution I had said that while delinking job from educational degrees and providing for functional qualifications and providing sufficient protection and representation to the weaker sections of our society, we should have a discriminate system of education and admission in our higher education. All these things we have been saying time and again. I should also like to say that these are not new ideas. I am not saying something fantastically new which nobody else has even thought of when I say that essentially education, work, labour and productivity must go hand in hand. **This is an idea which has been universally accepted.** In fact most of the problems and many of the solutions

to those problems have been given by the Radhakrishnan Committee and wherever there was some lacuna it was provided by the Kotari Committee. There is hardly anything that we need to know from any new Commission that we did not know. But that greatest problem is implementation. That is where everything fails. It is at the level of implementation that nothing seems to move. I would be the last person to say that we have made no achievement in our educational system. We certainly have made tremendous achievements in spreading education. We have also got an oasis of excellence. But that remains an oasis in the desert of what we call either illiteracy or useless and irrelevant education.

I would say that the greatest need today is for innovation, change, experimentation and willingness to try new methods and discard high-bound customs, traditions and rituals of education. Our goal is to remove poverty in five years or six years, remove unemployment—I do not know in how many years....

SHRI N. G. RANGA: Ten years.

DR. V. P. DUTT: I would like to point out that the NSS estimates that there are at present 19 million man-years of unemployment and that 70 million persons have to be provided work in the next decade. This means creating something like 200,000 employment, units a week. This cannot be wage employment, but outside the wage employment sector and the Government itself will admit that no known economy can create employment at this rate. How are you going to solve and who is going to implement? In fact, I was interested to read the Isharbhay Patel Committee Report. Very good ideas are there and they say at the end:

"We are strongly of the view that physical conditions in which the teachers and children could work together must be made by providing

suitably designed buildings, class room space, teaching aids, science equipment, facilities for socially useful productive work...."—that is the new word for labour—"and productivity and recreation".

It is all right and I do not want to play upon words. They go on to say:

"We feel that if teaching conditions are made reasonably congenial, creative and experimental work can be developed."

I would ask you who is going to do this. Who is going to create these conditions? Who is going to provide these buildings and class room space and the teaching aids and science equipment? Is there really any massive national effort being made to provide these things? Where is the implementation going to be? Sir, the question of illiteracy has been mentioned, the question of providing even primary education to all the eligible children. I not only say that the task is colossal, but I am also cynical enough to point out that it would not be achieved in three years or five years or even ten years, although my friend, Prof. Ramlal Parikh believes that everything is being done now. He is a good friend of mine and I admire him and I do hope that he does not dislike me either and we have many things in common. But, I am sorry, he is probably new to the treasury benches and he has more enthusiasm and also more of optimism and expectation. But the analyses that we have been making, the exercises that we have been undertaking, over the last ten years do not warrant really any optimism in this respect. Sir, in order to provide primary education for every eligible child, you have to provide facilities for five crores of children. The total number of children attending schools would be 4.52 crores—1.37 crores for class I to class V, and 3.15 crores for classes VI to VIII and if this is from the Report itself—the 22 per cent of the enrolment in classes I to V of children who are either under-

age or overage is taken into account, then facilities will have to be provided for more than five crores of children. The story does not end here, because, even where children are registered, a great deal of it is bogus registration. They are not really there in the classes. As I have mentioned earlier, 75 per cent of the children drop out by the time they reach class IX. So, you have to provide for a total of 64 lakhs of children during the five-year period from 1977-78 to 1982-83. As I said, this is virtually an impossible task and, not in the next three or five or ten years, but in another twenty years, if we could achieve this, I would personally be satisfied. But the way we have been going, the way we are stuck up, the inertia that has come to seize us—I am talking of this only and I am not blaming this person or that person, this agency or that agency, but of the inertia that is there—and, more than this inertia, I would say, unfortunately, the ill-advised policies, the ill-advised concepts, the ill-advised thinking, of a great many important people, I don't think it is possible to achieve this during this period. But, Sir, I would like to make a very serious proposition. My esteemed and elderly colleague, Shri Kamalapati Tripathi, is here. I have my party leader, Shri Bhola Paswan Shastri who is here. Shri Kalp Nath Rai is here. Dr. Lokesh Chandra is here. My proposition, Sir, is that the fundamental problem of education of India is the problem of education of the Hindi belt. I am making a very serious proposition. I have studied this question. Let me say with all seriousness that the problem is that of education in the Hindi belt area. Sir, 74 per cent of the non-enrolled students, that is, students who are not getting even minimum literacy, are in eight States. And the largest number of them are in four States of the Hindi-speaking area. Out of 3.58 crore children, non-enrolled children, between the ages of 6-14, actually one-half belong to the Hindi belt States—Bihar, U.P., Madhya Pradesh and

[Dr. V. P. Dutt]

Rajasthan. In Bihar, the number of non-enrolled children between the ages of 6-11, is 40 lakhs, between 11-14, 28 lakhs; the total is 68 lakhs. In Madhya Pradesh, those between 6-11 number 37 lakhs and those between 11-14, 29 lakhs. The total comes to 66 lakhs. In Rajasthan, the number of non-enrolled children between 6-11, is 34 lakhs, and those between 11-14, 17 lakhs; the total comes to 51 lakhs. In Uttar Pradesh, the number of non-enrolled children, between the ages of 6 to 11, is 24 lakhs, and those between 11 and 14, 41 lakhs; the total comes to 67 lakhs. In Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Orissa and Jammu and Kashmir, this problem is not of the same magnitude. That is why, I would like my elder colleagues to consider and ponder over this question as to what has gone wrong there. I say, what has gone wrong is the educational fanaticism in these States, unfortunately. And please consider this as a national problem—not from any narrow point of view, but as a national problem.

One other thing that I would like to add, Sir, while on this question of national effort to remove illiteracy, is how can you remove illiteracy, how can you expect these teachers and these schools, two-thirds of whom have to cater to villages and village boys, to be really dedicated in the kind of conditions that we are giving them? In fact, it is a mockery. We are mocking at them by, on the one hand, telling that they should have 'guru-chela' relationship and not think of material benefits, and, on the other hand, a school teacher gets not as much as a peon gets in this country. Sir, my friend, Dr. Ram Lal Parikh, talked of the Soviet Union. Let me say that in the Soviet Union, one of the first things that they did was to raise the status of the school teachers and to provide special benefits and special incentives to school teachers to take up this work. In fact, most of their effort in the first few years of reconstruction was spent on removing illiteracy

and improving the schools, especially the primary and secondary schools. Sir, in this connection, I have some other misgivings, fears and apprehensions which I would like to mention to the hon. Minister. I have gone through all the reports that he has released so far and very carefully. As I said, there are many good ideas in many of them. Now, with the new system, new scheme of curricula and syllabi and courses that are going to be offered to our schools, I cannot resist the impression or I cannot resist the apprehension that we may be going backwards and that there is a denigration of science, new mathematics and economics. I am all for making the system flexible using the diversity of India. I am also in favour of not compelling the child to cram too much. Therefore, I am all for intellectual stimulation. But it appears to me, if my reading is correct, that even in the 9th and 10th classes, you have introduced awful categories whereby a person who takes history, civics and geography will not be studying any economics and may not be studying science either and a student who takes science will probably have nothing to do with history, civics and economics. Now, Sir, if my impression is correct in any case, I am totally opposed to this kind of optional categorisation—I feel that we may look back to the past and we may try to create Ram Rajya so far as social situation is concerned and social equalities are concerned, but we have to look to the future also. We have to look forward also. We have to keep abreast of the strides that are being made in the world in science, in technology, in new Mathematics and in technical studies. I have a fear that we are slipping into anti-diluvian policies. I am giving a word of caution that let us give careful thought to it and let us not play with the future of this country and the future of our country. Let us give very careful consideration to it. It is all right saying that you should not put too much burden on them. But at the same time, they have to keep this

country in line with the progress that is being made elsewhere. They have to see that this country takes its rightful place in the comity of advanced nations of the world. To my mind, no country which ignores science and the scientific spirit and mathematics will be able to take rapid strides. In fact, my complaint has always been that in our schools, especially in the villages and even in the towns, we have made machine a kind of a dreadful thing whereas what we should be doing is to train our people to master the machine, to lose his fear and dread of it and to be able to innovate it, experiment with it and take the country forward with his independent thinking. I do agree that there are certain basic differences of approach in some areas between you and us. I will mention just a few. You want private enterprise to undertake education mostly, whereas we, at least, I certainly, stand for the society to undertake this responsibility. I do not want commercial managers of education. You seem to believe in the philosophy of capitalism and private enterprise in education, and I do not. You do not want any textbooks to be prepared by the society, by the Government, by the nation as such but only privately done. I believe, and I think, many other colleagues believe that the teaching materials must broadly subserve the national ideology enunciated in the preamble to the Constitution—socialism, democracy and secularism. How are you going to ensure this unless there are some broad teaching materials subserving these ends and prepared by the society, prepared by the Government and prepared by the country to be used in the country? And also, how are you going to promote national integration unless you give attention to this aspect? We know that in the past, communal poison was spread through our educational institutions. I have heard myself many examples given in

this House as to how communal poison was spread through our school curriculum some five or ten years ago. And today—it is not a party thing for me,

it is a matter of convictions—again I feel that the communal obscurantist ideology of the RSS is infiltrating into our educational institutions, from the schools to the colleges and to the universities. My friend here mentioned one college, the Rajdhani College. I do not want to take the names. But the fact remains that today they are infiltrating, they are trying to entrench themselves. I have nothing against the people individually. I am talking of the communalist, obscurantist ideology, and that is taking hold of our education and our educational institutions. That is why, we have stood for education being in the Concurrent List. It is not a question of dogma. We must ensure that the content of education is secular, democratic and socialist. And also, there is another point. You are making these national policies on education. And who is to ensure that they are being implemented? When the subject is in the Concurrent List, it does not mean that it is only a Central subject. It will only mean that the States implement the schemes, but the Centre has also the right to ensure, to over-see that they are being implemented. (*Time bell rings*).

Finally, Sir, I will make one or two points. One is the question of vocationalisation. I do not want to enter into the controversy of 10 plus 2 plus 3 or 8 plus 4 plus 3 or whatever you like. I think, I will ask the hon. Minister to clarify the position. I am getting more and more confused as to what really is the policy. I do not want to enter into it. But it has been accepted that there shall be an attempt an effort, a massive effort at vocationalisation of education in between 10 and 12 classes. It is on that that I would like to mention just one or two points.

Sir, I am speaking from experience. If you want to succeed in that, do not split those who work with the hands and those who work with their minds. What I am saying is, let there be an

[Dr. V. P. Dutt]

opportunity to move from one into the other. Let not an inferiority complex be given to those who go in for skilled training. Let them not be condemned as second class citizens. Let them have an opportunity also, if they demonstrate merit, to go to colleges and universities. (*Time Bell rings*). This way, if we say that this is the terminal stage, if we say that those who are not good enough to go into the educational stream, will go into the vocational stream, we will be inviting disaster for vocationalisation. That is why it has not made progress during the last one year or so. I say, therefore, that the skill-based education should not be isolated and divorced from the knowledge-based education and that the relationship between education and labour work, productivity, skilled training, should go together all along in one form or other, from the beginning to the highest university education. Of course, there will be some who will go only for one or the other form, but let us provide for flexibility so that the scheme does not come to grief. This is a good scheme. Let it not come to grief for fear that if we go in for vocational education, it is good for nothing, and we will be considered as second class citizens. Sir, I do not want to speak on higher education because the time is not there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV) : Please conclude now.

DR. V. P. DUTT: I hope that there will be an opportunity, when we discuss the University Grants Commission Report, to speak on higher education.

Sir, here I would just like to make one small comment about it. The University Grants Commission has produced an excellent report on the development of higher education in India, a policy trend. We should seriously consider this report and subsequently discuss it. Sir, I would like to commend the University Grants Commission,

its Chairman, Prof. Satish Chandra, other office-bearers as well as the members of the Commission, for the work that they have done. Therefore, I would only like to point out the problem pinpointed by them, and that is that this system has become a gigantic monolith, very difficult to move or change....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: At what page is it mentioned?

DR. V. P. DUTT:....and in spite of its achievements, which are by no means inconsiderable, it has proved itself to be inadequate to meet our national needs and aspirations. The system maintains a set of double standards. A small minority of educational institutions at all levels is of good quality and compares favourably with those in the developed countries. But this core of good institutions is surrounded by a large number of institutions where although there is open door access the standards have deteriorated.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please conclude now.

DR. V. P. DUTT: I am concluding, Sir. These are the aspects that have to be given attention and I would like to emphasise what we have been saying, what every friend of mine here has said, namely, that our educational system should not be by the elite, for the elite and of the elite only, and that, at the same time, we should not get into fanaticism, whether of the language type, whether of the ritual or education type or whether of the methods of education. We should not get into any kind of fanaticism but we have to make a national effort to make our education relevant and labour oriented. For this, I would suggest that the hon. Minister of Education consider calling meetings at various levels of the various political parties, of academicians and of others, for making such a national effort to change, or for arriv-

ing at, at least, the minimum consensus, and also at the State level, where it is most important, and also at the grass-roots level, where the community must be involved, where all the leaders of the community must be involved. *(Time Bell Rings.)* Let that be done. I would, once again, like to make my humble submission to the hon. Minister any say that let that be done in order to change and overhaul the educational system of India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Mr. Chanana.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated): One minute, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I had submitted to the Chairman the day before yesterday that somehow it has become the practice that the nominated Members, who remain unattached, are only called at the fag end of the debate. I have submitted it for his consideration. While I appreciate the role of the parties in this system, the entire purpose of functional representation by persons like me is not worth its attention if we get the opportunity by 7 or 7.30, at the time when the House is exhausted and when the Minister is overwhelmed by the rich ideas and the wise words thrown from there. Therefore, as an act of protest, I would like to walk out of the House for the first time, because I have spoken to the Chairman, I spoke to the Deputy Chairman and I wrote to the Secretary-General also and I find that no attention is being paid to our legitimate right. If our voices are not worthy of being heard . . .

(Interruptions).

DR. V. P. DUTT: May I make a suggestion? Actually, if I had known, I would have given my time to Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan. Therefore, I would request you to call Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan earlier and I would request Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan not to carry out his walk-out. In fact, I would have gladly given my time to him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): I think Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan gets time every time. On the External Affairs debate also, he got the time. What can be said about it? The parties are there; they have got their own time. We have to go by the party-line. How can separate time be given? He will get his time also. One person from 'Others' has been called already.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: I have submitted that while I respect the parties' role—and I am writing a long note—I think after the first round of the parties is over, you should show indulgence to those who speak very rarely and speak either on educational or foreign policy or on problems of national importance. I never take part in the Question Hour; I have never given my name for the Calling Attention, because I think that my role is very limited and specific. And when that specific role is over-ruled, what is the purpose of my staying on for hours? I am not interested to hear my own voice if you think that my voice is not worthy of being heard by others. . . .

(Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): One Member from 'Others' has already spoken in the first round and we are now taking the second round.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, on a point of order. And that is, as has been made out by hon. Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan, I think it is ridiculous to have an educationist and an expert on external affairs of the stature of Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan to . . .

(Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): But this you see, I have already said that one person from 'Others' has spoken . . . *(Interruptions).*

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: I am referring to the manner in which the Chair and the Secretariat prepare the list. I am only referring to that. My request is, once the first round of the speakers is exhausted, immediately, he should be also....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Let me explain; perhaps, you are not aware as to how many persons have already spoken. We started with Congress, then Congress I, Janata, CPI, ADMK and one from amongst the 'Others' and these persons have already spoken. What can be done?

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Who-so-ever is responsible, I feel Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan is being wronged and we strongly protest against the manner in which he is being called at the fag end.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): That can be discussed with the Chair and we can arrive at an agreement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, we have been discussing this thing. I agree with him and I agree with Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan also very much. In such matters, Sir, you have to follow your own rule. Sir, the practice in the past has been, especially when the subjects like this, science, education, culture, etc., are discussed, those who are particularly conversant with these subjects—and in fact, they come to the Rajya Sabha nominated on the ground of being connected with them—should get priority. Sir, I do not mind ..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): They got the chance.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think one round should go to the parties....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): There is no denying.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then an Independent Member should be called. As far as I am concerned, in such matters I am in favour of them even if you like that some of the parties may come later. Let us hear Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Everyone has spoken...

SHRI BHOLA PASWAN SHASTRI (Bihar): Sir....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Please.

श्री भोला पासवान शास्त्री (बिहार) : समय बहुत कम है लेकिन जो मन में बात आती है उसको मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। माननीय सदस्य प्रो० रशीदुद्दीन खान की जो भावना है मैं उसको महसूस करता हूँ। इसलिए कि मैं भी 6 वर्ष से इस सदन का सदस्य हूँ और जब से आया हूँ उन के भाषण को सुनने का मौका मिला। वह विशेषज्ञ है और खास ही मौकों पर वह बोलते हैं। यह ठीक है कि पार्टी को देख कर टाइम मिलता है और दूसरी पार्टी के मैम्बर ज्यादा है लेकिन उनकी सेवा इस सदन की माफत देश को मिलनी चाहिए। मैं आपको नहीं कहता हूँ कि आपने उनको अक्रोमोडेट नहीं किया और न मुझे किसी से शिकायत है। मैं इसको महसूस करता हूँ। प्रो० रशीदुद्दीन खान जो यहां आए हैं उनकी सेवा का देश को मौका मिलना चाहिए। उनके विचार देश को मिलने चाहिए और बराबर मिलते भी रहे हैं। उन्होंने चेयरमैन साहब से जाकर कहा, निवेदन किया लेकिन अक्रोमोडेट नहीं हो सके। जो बीत गया सो बीत गया। मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ और आपसे यह निवेदन करता हूँ कि उन के बहुमूल्य मुझाव हम

को मिलने चाहिए। जैसी उनकी फ़ील्म है इस से हमें दुख हुआ है। उनको अवश्य मौका मिलना चाहिए।

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: You should revise your decision.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): He will get his chance.

श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी : सदन की राय है कि प्रो० रशीदुद्दीन खान को बोलने दिया जाए।

DR. SARUP SINGH (Haryana): Sir, Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan may be given a chance. I withdraw my name.

(Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): I have called Mr. Chanana. After him, I will call Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan. Other parties will suffer. Dr. Sarup Singh has withdrawn his name. (Interruptions) Members should not be so much sensitive on this. I would request the leaders of all parties to discuss the whole matter of allotting time to different parties with the Chairman and the Secretariat. They prepare the list. I have to go by the list which is prepared here. One or two Members are always accommodated.

SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA (Delhi): Sir I shall comment only on a part of the process started by the Janata Government ever since they came to power; in fact, right from the day when they released their election manifesto which was full of slogans. I am touching only a part of it. In this process of undoing all that was done in the past, they should give exemption to a few subjects which are very delicate subjects like foreign affairs, as I had submitted the other day in this House. Perhaps, education is a more important subject which should be given exemption, not only exemption, but it should also be given national attention; it needs the national attention, of people who are living today. I

1039 RS—9.

am purposely saying 'people living today'. When I am saying people, I am including in this particular category, the policy-makers, the educationists and the experts. They have one accusation on them today. Everybody is saying that the problem today is the generation gap. Now, why and how this generation gap came into existence? How is it being felt by the next generation, the children who are ten years ahead of us? They also feel that we do not live today, but that we live in yesterday.

My hon. friend was talking of the system of education which our elders had, when they did not have any books at all. They read without books. They became educated without degrees. That was a wonderful system. We did not call them 'educated'. But they were more than that. Their outlook was very rich. Now, you have a system which is a different one. In fact, you were born in a system which was an imported one. We have to get out of it. This will not be a simple exercise.

Now, Sir, before I go on, I would like to start with a few presumptions and I would like my friends to bear this in mind whenever they make such statements. Mahatma Gandhi is the Father of the Nation. Besides that, he was a great philosopher. One very important thing which he said was that he should not be quoted in future. He said 'Don't quote me in future; quoting me in future in words would be misquoting me. He might have said one thing in one situation and another in different situation. Therefore, when one is quoting Gandhiji and when one is trying to say that the system followed by the previous Government was in contradiction with the Gandhian philosophy, he is absolutely wrong, howsoever highly placed an educationist he is.

Now education policy in a society must be oriented in its social, cultural and philosophic outlook for

[Shri Charanjit Chanana.]

tomorrows to come. While we live today, we learn from yesterday, but we build infrastructure for tomorrows to come. Otherwise, the next generation will not pardon us at all; that is the very important thing.

Sir, a wonderful Committee that the hon. Education Minister created as the President of the NCERT was the Patel Committee to review the curriculum for the 10-year school. Now I would give a preamble to this report, which the Members must know, that this Committee was created at a time—in fact, I wrote an article and it was published in daily newspapers—when promises and counter promises were made by the Ministers, statements and contradictions were made by the Ministers and even by the Prime Minister. In the field of education I can give you a list, a statistical table, where the hon. Education Minister has made one statement and the hon. Prime Minister has contradicted it. And this is a change that we see in the newspapers and all of you would agree with me on this, and that is a very horrifying phenomenon created by this.

The other day I made a submission in this House and the hon. Education Minister was kind enough to have given it a jargon of beautiful English vocabulary. I wish that that beautiful jargon could evolve a system, but unfortunately, that does not evolve a system. My submission that day was that you have already created a confusion. I would, therefore, like to request that you have an opinion poll conducted on a scientific basis, involving educationists, teachers, parents and children, because all these plus many more people are partners in the system that you are trying to evolve.

I started with this Committee. In Geometry we used to prove theorems. We were given a theorem and similarly, a theorem was given to this Committee, it appears, that they

have to prove that the system evolved by the NCERT was not good. Had they restricted themselves to the syllabi, it was all right, but the terms of reference of the Committee were wider. On page 2 of this Committee's Report it is said:

"In the opinion of the Committee the terms of reference were wide enough not only to permit a review of the objectives and scheme of studies set out in the document. 'The curriculum for the Ten-Year School' but also to identify the principles for formulating a new scheme."

So, this Committee was almost made a big commission. Fortunately, the Committee starts with a very good paragraph which only is to enlighten the people who want to understand the exercise which was undergone by the system, ignoring the first para. The first para says: The recommendations of the Education Commission—i.e. the Kothari Commission 1964—66—this is very important—worked for a period of two years whereas this Committee which claim to convert itself into a commission worked only for a few months and produced this report, including the time consumed in its printing—were considered by the Government of India and the Resolution on the National Policy on Education was adopted after consulting both the Houses of Parliament in 1968. Now after the National Resolution of Education was adopted the first part of the implementation was initiated at that time itself. Now I would like to draw the kind attention of the House as also the Members who talk of the rural education being ignored etc., that this particular commission—the hon. Education Minister would know it better than me—consisted of 12 task forces and 7 working groups. See the composition of each task force.

I would just like to give headings of the task forces which are very important in the discussion here because that would only give you the coverage of the commission.

No. 1 is the task force on adult education. No. 2 is the task force on agricultural education. No. 3 is the task force on educational administration. No. 4 is the task force on educational finance. No. 5 is the task force on higher education. No. 6 is the task force on manpower. No. 7 is the task force on techniques and methods in education. No. 9 is the task force on science education. No. 10 is the task force on school education.

These are the task forces, and then you have got seven working groups on these. This is not a simple exercise. This is a Commission which consisted of top educationists in the country, the policy-makers, the academicians and applied scientists. Therefore, to have ignored this by just creating a theorem for a Review Committee is not a proper thing at all.

My second point is this. I would only like to draw the kind attention of the House to the magnitude of the subject with which you are dealing. According to the population figures of 1971, the school education system covers the age group from 6 to 19. I am not trying to create that equation. I will talk about that when I come to 10 plus 2 plus 2 or 3. In 1971, out of 54.71 crores, the 6-19 age-group, which is your ultimate aim to be educated—I am talking of the whole thing in terms of your slogans about education—is 19.56 crores. In 1976, the estimates say that out of 60.19 crores total population, 22.27 crores lie in 6-19 age group. In 1981, out of 67.20 crores, this would be touching 25 crores. The estimates are 24.44 crores, but then these keep on revising. In 1981, the figures, as they stand today, would be 24.44 crores.

Now the reason why I am resorting to these statistics is that you have to deal with the future of 25 crores of the children of this country. This is not a small thing. That is the population which touches the population of the United States of America. The process having been already evolved by the Commission—which you are still trying to play with; it has not yet been finalised—I would say that this is a very big call to you. You are a great nationalist also and you are a great educationist also. My only appeal to you is, if you think of covering the children, who would be in the age-group 6 to 19 in the year 1981—I am not wanting you to go far off—these will be 25 crores. You have to decide how much of this population would be imparted education and what type of education you are to impart to them. The second important thing is what would be the product out of this education.

My hon. friend, Dr. V. P. Dutt, has just talked of the NSS figures which are old figures. I would like to give you the latest NSS figures. The 27th round of the NSS puts the unemployment figure at 40 million. He talked of 19 million. You can see the difference between the last round and this round. It is almost hundred per cent increase. What is going to happen in future? I will give you a break-up of the age group of the population between 6 and 19 who would be coming forth for employment. In 1981, you will have to think of employment for 7.33 crores. Now if you keep both these things in view—this is my submission to you—and try to see the magnitude of the whole problem, you will realise that such a problem should not be dealt with at all at a casual level because that, you would agree with me, would be a national crime. I would like to say as a student of economics that a new mould given by the Patel Committee has

[Shri Charanjit Chanana] already extended the structure of education. I am now talking of the economics of the system that you have already initiated. A new mould given by the Patel Committee has extended the structure of education because now you have created a wonderful distinction between the structure and the content. You are now putting more stress. The new method given by the Patel Committee extended the structure of the education system to the 26 States and Union Territories. I would only like to tell you one thing that Kerala was the first State in 1967-68, immediately after the National Resolution was accepted, to have adopted this system. West Bengal, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu accepted the whole system in 1974 although Tamil Nadu has now adopted the curriculum which has been given by the N.C.E.R.T. Karnataka and Andhra have already adopted the system. This is besides those within that group of 26 States and Union Territories. I would like you to feed the imagination of all of us as to what is going to happen to the system which started in 1968. What would it cost if you put the whole system in this reverse gear? The system was, in fact, introduced on 1-5-75 by the N.C.E.R.T. The expenditure incurred on evolving the system, the effort put in, the experiment about the cost borne by the children are very important. I am not talking about the budgetary provision in terms of money spent by the State Governments and the Central Government. I am talking of the tremendous cost which is to be evaluated in terms of impact on the children when you reverse the whole thing. My basic question to the law-makers, the policy-makers and the implementors of the policy, the educationists, the experts is that they have the responsibility because they are acting as the custodians of the future of today's children and, as such, do they have the right to feed them with

their personal prejudices and predilections? Do they have the authority? These are the issues. Can they politicise the system of education?

I agree with the hon'ble friends who have raised the issue that the system of education or the management of the institutions is being politicised in a very big way. These political forces are trying to create national networks wherefrom they would be able to generate their political systems in the educational institutions. I am reminded of one of my great teachers that the object of education is to generate and create such students as have the power, as have the capacity to discriminate the right from the wrong. If you have already biased the whole system and if you are going to feed the system with political fuel, then you can imagine what you are going to have—whether you are going to have a democratic State or a theocratic State or a State which would be hued in whatever colour, whatever input you put into it. That input would decide whether it should be 8 plus 4 or 10 plus 2 plus 3.

The system of education in our country has also had one richness. I have to remind the hon'ble Minister and the Members that we were told by our elders to respect our teachers as Guru Pita. That is what we are trying to do for the simple reason that there is confusion. What is happening today? There is cleavage between the teacher, the parents and the child. By generating new confusion what are you doing? In the earlier system they were meeting the teachers and the students. They would discuss the whole system. I would give you the example of a man who headed the group of 6 P.M.

mathematicians. He is a person who happens to be a mathematician, a professor in an American university. This man did

not agree with the American system, or the system of modern mathematics, the way America has evolved it. He also did not agree with the Soviet system as the Soviet mathematicians had evolved it. Now you would agree with me that this is one science in which our country is very rich with experts and academicians. This is the country where the birth of the concept of zero had taken place. But zero should not be equated with nothingness. It is a mathematical concept. That is supplemented by one particular fact, as many hon. friends said here, that Indian mathematicians, Indian physicists and Indian scientists abroad—I am talking of Indians in advanced countries—are having status which has won them Nobel Prizes and other international prizes. Now you have to evolve a system for 25 crores of people where you produce not two or three Nobel Prize winners but you will have to think of starting with 25 Nobel Prize winners or more than that. If you have to do that, you will have to be very serious about it and you should not at all be casual about it, just by appointing a committee which will give you a product that you want. (*Time-bell rung.*)

The social, political and economic infrastructure of the country demands from the futurologists in the country the evolution of a system. This is a very important challenge which I am throwing to you. You will have to evolve a system where the children of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes are educated and brought up in an environment, in a system, so that by the time they are grilled out of the system of education they are the top citizens of the country and they are as brilliant sociologists, scientists and experts including, of course, politicians, as any other. I am not depriving these lower castes the opportunity to produce politicians also.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: You have said "lower castes". There is no lower caste or higher caste here.

SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA: I am sorry, I did not mean it. The criterion should be an optimum system for the country. We would like you to take it as a challenge and accept it as a challenge so that this system of education would raise a class which would not like to be classed as Scheduled Castes and so on. Why should the child of a Scheduled Caste always remain at the same level? The educational system should be such as would give top priority to the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes in different parts of the country and to start, with, first priority should be given to convert them as top citizens. Not only should they be given school-going facilities, My suggestion to you is that these children should have boarding schools. They should not only be provided with teachers, books and other facilities but they should also have an environment. The system of education should be able to create an environment which we used to have long ago in the ancient ashrams of ours where the children used to be sent away for education. My first schooling was in an ashram where I was sent away from home. The institution of ashram was created for the simple reason that there should be no difference between the child of a rich man and the child of a poor man, where they were only students and where the guardian of the students used to be the teacher, the guru. The guru used to enjoy the status of a father to them.

My challenge and my submission to the Janata Government is that if at all they want to do a thing like that, they should evolve a system which would give top priority for giving education to the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes.

Thank you, Sir.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, let me start first by mentioning that what I submitted for your consideration was no reflection on my friendship towards you. As a matter of fact Sir, I feel very much overwhelmed by the spontaneous response which I have received from the Leader of the Opposition, Shri Kamalapati Tripathi, the leaders of the Congress Party, Shri Bhola Paswan Shastri, the leader of the Communist Party, Shri Bhupesh Gupta Dr. Sarup Singh of the Janata Party, my friends, Dr. V. P. Dutt, Mr. Dwivedi, the Union Minister of Education, Shrimati Barkataki and my friend, Mr. Sinha, Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, indeed from all quarters because I was submitting about a role which I think has some relevance to the provision for representation of functional groups and functional interests, and I will have occasion to submit it a little later. The hour is late and I would not like to go into the many aspects of the educational policy notes on which I was trying to make this forenoon; I shall restrict to only a couple of its aspects.

I can do no better than begin by appropriately reverting the attention of the House to the Independence Day broadcasting message of the President Sanjiva Reddy. He said many things. I quote,

"The country's political system can function only within the framework of accepted norms."

"There is need for an ennobling vision of a resurgent India, imbued with a crusading spirit and an exhilarating sense of participation in a common effort".

"A credible gap should not be allowed to develop between the mass of our people and those in position of authority."

He has given voice to the sentiments of his compatriots in this regard. Therefore, I approach the problem of educational policy with certain trepidation, with a certain sense of seriousness, especially because we are talking of the educational policy of the second most populated country in the world,

the largest country of the non-aligned movement, and a country which has committed itself to the building of a new educational policy. Therefore, I submit that like the foreign policy, the educational policy, in all fairness, ought to be a policy of national consensus, at least in its broad perspective and the larger strategy of implementation. The policy should not get vitiated merely by the change of Government or shift in administration. In fact, I submit that during the last 30 years, one of the achievements is, if one can say within modest limits that the foreign policy and the educational policy have by and large remained the policies of national consensus, and this was taken as axiomatic. There had been a universal commitment to the values of democratisation of politics, secularisation of society, socialisation or at least increasing social control of the economy and the means of production, and I will add inculcation of the values of composite culture in order to coningle the many streams of regional and linguistic diversities into an ever expanding mighty river of national sustenance that would not dry up the myriad streams that voluntarily, inevitably and regularly flow into its confluence, but in addition expand as a consequence of this. We had also sought to reconcile our rich socio-cultural heritage with the vital elements of global techno-scientific culture and the temper of enquiry, rationalism and humanism, in order to become effective components of the growing and inter-dependent world family of man.

We thought that the majesty of our system and the vitality of our democratic experience especially in education would not be tampered with merely by the change of Government. Since the challenges remain more or less the same, the instruments of implementation also remain the same and the general direction of Parliamentary control and vigilance is in tact, hopes were raised that the Janata Party would not depart from the path of national consensus, but I am sorry to say that when one examines very carefully the shifts and turns, the withdrawals and marking times, the hesi-

tations and capitulations, the inertia and non-action in the working of the Union Education Ministry as exhibited in the past 16 months, one gets almost possessed by a sense of disquiet and despair, no less than by a mood of indignation and anger.

Sir, those who say that they are happy under all circumstances and satisfied in every situation they face, are, I submit modestly, either sublime hypocrites or ridiculously insensitive characters. I confess that when one looks at the future of the country and the prospect of national development, with which everyone is concerned, even elementary patriotism should make one alert and vigilant. Sometimes, therefore, one feels very concerned and angry.

My basic submission in all seriousness for the consideration of the Minister and the Ministry is that the Janata Government's Education Policy has generated confusion, cynicism and demoralisation in the ranks of the teachers and the taught as well as in a large cross-section of our citizenry, by contradictory statements, needless experimentation and, above all, by side-tracking the national consensus on the goal and strategy of education. While the Congress Government used to drift and drift tragically in matters of education, the Janata Government, it appears to me, is almost out to wreck the very edifice of national education and culture which has been assiduously built over the last thirty years. I am pretty sure that the Education Minister would be startled by this statement—and in his unenviable innocence and becoming naivety might even feel offended. Nothing farther for me than to offend persons, certainly not a person whose patriotism and liberal outlook are as manifest as those of Dr. Chunder. But let him and others in the Ministry realise that some of us who have honestly and patiently watched the working of the Ministry for a year and a half, without so much as openly criticising in public, have now reached a stage where

silence would be tantamount to connivance and repugnant to the very ethos and expectations of a parliamentary system. Therefore, I submit for your consideration some aspects.

Sir, it is a fact that when we talk of policy process, we talk of at least six components. Firstly we talk of identification of goals and objectives. Secondly, we talk of formulation of a National Perspective for policy perception and policy articulation. Thirdly, concretisation of proposals, steps modalities for each component of policy. Fourthly, implementation. Fifthly, monitoring of implementation process for rectification or modification of the direction and pace. Lastly, performance evaluation at periodic intervals. I do not have time at the moment to go into each of these components. But for considering the performance of the Ministry, one can judge on all these counts as to how it has worked. There is neither time nor occasion at the moment to dilate on this theme.

Briefly, let me say that the Education Ministry is at least ambivalent and, therefore, confused and is confusing others about the goals and objectives and the national perspective. On the one hand, we have an excellent document prepared by the UGC in February 1978—mention has already been made about it by my friend Dr. V. P. Dutt—entitled "Higher Education in India—A Policy Frame"; and, on the other hand, we have a whole host of pronouncements and speeches by the hon. Education Minister and administrative arrangements made by the Ministry which are reported in the press. There is I submit, an apparent conflict of position between the two. In fact, it is nothing new in this country that the printed documents are prepared by experts and well-meaning bureaucrats, and the policy pronouncements are made by active politicians, and a careful content analysis would reveal a deviation between the two.

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

Apart from divergence in goals and perspectives it is at the implementation level, I submit, that—this is a very important level—the areas of change and compromise become evident. Let me give a single example. The UGC document rightly emphasises the three weaknesses of our system, namely, dominance of the models and value system adopted during the colonial regime; secondly, maintenance of a set of double standards one for the affluent few and the other for the miserable millions; thirdly, the proportionate benefits of education accruing to the upper-middle classes to the neglect of backward classes. Therefore, the document very rightly suggests a drastic overhaul through the introduction of “a modern scientific outlook” by promoting “ethical values and human welfare enshrined by science and technology and promotion of rational outlook, a scientific outlook”, etc. etc. In this spirit, among other things, adult education is to receive high priority. The document says that the programme of adult education should strive to make all adults of age group 21–35 functionally literate, and lay the greatest emphasis on the non-formal education of the youth (age group 15–21); a massive programme of motivating adults and enthusing and training voluntary workers will have to be developed. All this is laudable. All this is well-taken and bright. But then what happens? What happens is that the RSS is invited in a big way to permeate the entire programme of adult education. Let me add, as a democrat I have no objection to RSS working there. I think the vision and strength of India will fight all negative forces. I have friends among the RSS. Among the RSS I have Bhandaris, I have Vajpayees, Advanis, Sinhas, etc. But the fact remains that when you invite the RSS in a big way, you are inviting agencies whose value orientation, whose major premises of national development, whose entire approach to politics, are too well known to stand scrutiny or any deeper

analysis. And what is interesting is that here I have the ORGANISER dated March 12, 1978 in which it is said; In the meeting of the Akhil Bharatiya Pratinidhi Sabha of the RSS which met between March 2 and 5, 1978 which incidentally is the highest policy-making body, they have adopted a resolution “The ABPS accepted—I underline this word—the Union Education Ministry’s invitation—I would like to underline these words—to help educate 10 crore illiterates in the 15–35 age group and called upon swayamsevaks to extend active cooperation to make the scheme a complete success.” It was noted that out of these 10 crores in this age group as many as 6 crores came in the Hindi area. Firstly, before examining even the nature of the RSS, particularly in terms of their value orientation, I would like to ask: Did the Education Minister invite the RSS? If so, would he kindly lay on the Table of the House the letter or the communication or the transcript of his oral invitation or whatever is relevant? Did he invite other organisations also and what are those and when? The ABPS says it accepted the Union Education Minister’s invitation. What is the text of the letter of acceptance and what are the *guid pro quo* involved? Since the ORGANISER says that there are 10 crore illiterates in the country, and of these about 6 crores are in Hindi area and assuming that at least the RSS will be interested in the education of the 6 crore illiterates in the Hindi area, if we calculate at the rate of 10 paise per head, for six crores the amount comes to Rs. 1 crore per annum. Is it the intention of the Education Ministry in order to help an organisation which it has invited to subsidise it in order to fight illiteracy in India? These are the problems. I am again speaking in a non-partisan manner. I have never spoken about the RSS earlier. But I would like to submit that the values of our national life and the consensus thereon are very clear, namely rationalism, secularism, democracy and if not socialism at least commitment to egalitarianism, that is,

treatment of all as equals. I would like to know whether the Education Ministry has examined whether RSS subscribe to these values. I would welcome RSS's interest in change---changing even the Imam of Jama Masjid, Bokhari. Indianisation should take place in the process of development of RSS. I would like RSS to be indianised. But by that I do not mean they should stop with the ancient age or stop even with the medieval age. I would like them to become the inheritors of the entire civilisation and culture of India together with the rich medieval culture and together with the scientific temperament of this period. In other words, I would like them to forget their past and become the authentic rational Indians. If so, RSS is welcome. This aspect is important because I understood that Shrimati Subhadra Joshi, the President of the Congress Committee here wrote to the Education Minister some time back. Since I have been associated with an organisation called Educators for Socialism, Secularism and Democracy, I am concerned to know the Education Minister's views in this regard. Is it necessary to recapitulate in the House the entire ethos of the RSS? I do not think so.

Let me now go to another point. What is the policy towards secondary and higher education? If you have a look at the policy document, certain approach emerges. But the fact remains that the entire experimentation of what is known as playing—with figures such as $10+2+3$ which has now become $8+2+2+3$ is all leading to tremendous strain on the academic administrators on the one hand and a large bulk of our young people on the other. Has the Education Ministry worked out the implications of the inclusion of higher education in the Concurrent List? What is the implication of shifting higher education from the State List to the Concurrent List? What is the policy? Is it a fact that attempt is being made even at this level to resurrect unreason, parochial outlook, communal

orientation and even obscurantism by allowing people belonging to Parties, who all the time advocate all these, to play a very big role in the field of education? For instance, some-times reports come from Rajasthan that about 60,000 teachers at the primary and secondary school levels have been inducted having close association with the RSS. Is it a fact? I would like the Education Minister to clarify this. I would like to find out whether the withdrawal of text books of the NCERT....

श्री प्रेम मनोहर : आपको हर चीज में आर० एम० एस० दिखाई दे रहा है। यह कब से आपको दिखाई देने लगा है।

(Interruptions)

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: Stop. Mr. Deputy Chairman, we want to hear him.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: My friend's agitation is very well founded. Had I been in the RSS I would have been offended to hear all these. Let my small voice of reason be heard inside the House. I would like to sit down and talk to him later.

I think the way the NCERT books have been withdrawn under the surreptitious attempt of an anonymous letter emanating from the Prime Minister's Secretariat, to put it mildly, is extraordinary. After all the Education Minister is expected to examine the entire episode. He belongs to the undivided Congress Party. He and his illustrious forebears have played a very important role in the national movement I am aware of it. When you withdrew the text books, did you examine what happened? The vacuum created by the withdrawal of these textbooks would be filled by academically unsound, wrongly focussed, cheap textbooks, which would be coming into the market through the process of cheap commercial competition in different parts of the country. So, what was the reason for the abolition of the Boards in the different subjects? Have you been able to appoint an alternative Board of Professors? I can understand that the

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan.]

policy-orientation of the Government approves a certain type of people and it does not approve of a certain type of people. Probably, some of us would not be interested to work in such an atmosphere. But has an alternative Board of eminent historians and political scientists and sociologists been appointed? This is what one would like to ask. On the one hand, respect for the autonomy of the university is being mentioned day in and day out and, on the other, an attempt is being made to uproot and encroach on the autonomy of the university. I am very much hesitating to talk about the Jawaharlal Nehru University. First of all, I belong to the Jawaharlal Nehru University and I have been there since its inception and it will appear as if I am offering an apology on behalf of the Jawaharlal Nehru University. Nothing of that sort. The Jawaharlal Nehru University and its distinguished faculties are capable of taking care of themselves in any public debate. That is not the point. But one thing I was trying to say. The manner in which the inquiry was conducted into the charges and the manner which it has been advertised are all very alarming. Firstly, I was a Member of the Executive which went to see the Chancellor and the Chancellor made it very clear the inquiry was being conducted within the framework of the University's autonomy and he mentioned: "I as the Chancellor am doing it". Strictly speaking, in terms of the Act, my impression is that except for the Visitor, nobody is entitled to institute an inquiry. It may be internal inquiry by the University body. For example, the Executive Council of the University could institute an inquiry and the Chancellor can conduct an internal inquiry. The University has paid for the services of a retired ICS officer to help in the examination of certain material... (Time bell rings)... and it was expected that the Chancellor of the University, working within the framework of the University Act, would send a report to the University body. But what

happens is that suddenly the distinction, a very vital distinction, very subtle distinction, between the Chancellor and the Prime Minister gets evaporated. The Chancellor acts like the Prime Minister and sends the Report not to the Jawaharlal Nehru University, but sends the Report to the Education Minister. The Prime Minister is within his jurisdiction to conduct an inquiry and inform the Education Ministry. I am not speaking about that and I am not disputing that. But, if he was conducting the inquiry as the Chancellor, then, I think, propriety demands that the Report should have first come to the University body and a copy, even an advance copy, of the Report could have been concurrently sent to the Ministry instead of its being sent straight to the Ministry first. Nothing of that sort was done. While you are to send it to the University body, you have not sent it and the Executive Council has met earlier and we have got the meeting adjourned to the 28th August and we just do not know what is happening.

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA: Was the inquiry conducted through a Deputy Secretary of the Transport Ministry or the Tourism Ministry?

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: I do not know what the distinguished person's background was. But one thing I must tell and that is that he is a retired civil servant and the University was asked to pay for his services and the University, because it was an internal inquiry, agreed to pay. All these inquiries could be paid for. But the fact is that the Report is still to come and has not come yet. In half-a-sheet of paper it is there in which 13 at-random complaints have been mentioned and a few sentences are there in the form of findings of the Chancellor supposed to have been communicated, but which does not give any indication except of the interference of the Chancellor even in the process of selection. After all, there was a

regular Selection Committee of the University, a Committee of external experts, and these Selection Committees are supposed to examine the candidates and come to certain conclusions. Nobody in the Selection Committee comes to any conclusion on the basis of any uni-dimensional screening of the bio-data or of the published papers which you are supposed to have published. Appointments are made only on the basis of curriculum vitae. The Selection Committee did nothing. Now anybody in the Department can say that he has got a First Class with 65.5 and another 64.5 and, therefore, he has got one per cent more and he should be appointed. That should not be the approach. The selection should be made on the basis of a complete organic assessment. I would only like to say about the manner in which it was leaked out in the papers. As a matter of fact, the "Times of India" report gives much more information. It says that "as a fraternal gesture, the teachers of the Delhi University have sympathised with us on which depends much and that the Jawaharlal Nehru University has become the preserve of the leftist ideologies". Now, it is a fact that in our University, we have eminent scholars who pretend at least formally to be Marxists and some of whom pretended to be Marxists of one brand or the other. There are others who have been inspired by the historical analysis of Marx, who have been inspired by what is called left ideology. But it is also a fact that there are people who neither subscribe to the Marxist school of thought or others. Some of them probably are neither Marxists nor anti-Marxists. There is a happy inter-connection of different groups. I would like some of you, Sir, to come and visit us, without informing us, and sit down in the class rooms and see how lectures are given and how things are done. No bell rings in our university, no attendance is marked in our university... (*Time bell rings*). This is a University where the 'free press' enjoys vicarious pleasure in mud-slinging. This is something

very alarming. This University was built with high hopes. This University need not be treated like this. One instance of the Janata Party's encroachment of the autonomy is the manner in which the Jawaharlal Nehru University affairs are publicly aired.... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, I will take two minutes. Sir, I have been particularly unhappy by looking at the affairs of the Institute of Advanced Studies, Simla. I happened to be in Simla in June. I had occasion to go to Simla some time in June. Sir, there the whole atmosphere is charged with disquiet, suspension, suspicion, misgivings as to what will happen. There are several aspects which should be examined. Proposals were made to improve its working. It is a very important national institute where occasionally seminars, conferences and meetings take place, where work has also been done—some good and some bad also. But to spread the impression that the Education Ministry is even thinking of winding up the Institute or at least removing the Institute from the place where it is located at the moment, is demoralising the scholars. I would request the Education Minister to take a more positive view in this matter. It is an important institute having eminent social scientists. Well, sometimes the rumours are that all parties extend patronage, the Congress had its share, and the Janata Party must also have its share. And if a person with his own background of University was recommended for appointment as Director of the Institute, well, that would be a sad day. I will suggest that the Education Minister must take into account all these factors, not in a partisan manner. He should act as a leader of national development. Sir, I say all this not in a spirit to accuse, not to derail, not even to attack, but as a student of Indian politics and problems. As a Member of Parliament, I feel greatly concerned, and as I mentioned previously, as far as the working of the Education Ministry is concerned, it leaves much to be desired.

Thank you very much.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बहुत खुशी है कि पंडित कमला पति त्रिपाठी जी मौजूद हैं और भोला पासवान शास्त्री भी हैं मैं सारी बातों को बहुत गौर से सुनता रहा और शिक्षा में थोड़ी मेरी रुचि भी है और बचपन ही से विद्यार्थियों में मैं काम करता रहा हूं। जो कुछ भी बातें यहां पर हुई हैं मुझकों निराशा ही हुई है। सरकार क्या करेगी इससे मुझे कोई मतलब नहीं है मगर हम लोगों की बुनियादी लड़ाई थी कि मुल्क में शिक्षा में आमूल परिवर्तन हुए बगैर मुल्क आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता। श्रीमन्, 23 बार कांग्रेस के राज में मुझकों जेल जाने का सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ। उसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि देश ने एक करवट ली और कांग्रेस पार्टी का कुशासन जिसको मैं कुशासन कहता हूं, उसका खात्मा हुआ। नेहरू जी के युग की थोड़ी मैं चर्चा करना चाहता हूं क्योंकि 1947 में हम लोगों ने देखा कि जिन लोगों के हाथ में सत्ता जा रही है ये मुल्क की खिदमत नहीं कर सकते हैं।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : सत्ता जा रही है।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : आप थोड़ा हमको बोल लेने दीजिए। मैं नया सदस्य हूं बाद में मैं भी आप जैसा हो जाऊंगा? तो हम लोगों के दिमाग में, सारे नौजवानों के दिमाग में जो डाक्टर राम मनोहर लोहिया के चरणों में हम लोगों ने राजनीति की और हम लोगों ने शपथ ली कि जिन लोगों के हाथ में सत्ता जा रही है इनकी दिशा कुछ और है यह चांदी के चम्मच से खाने वाले लोग, बड़े बड़े महलों में रहने वाले लोग इस मुल्क की भलाई नहीं कर सकते हैं। मैं शिक्षा का मसला श्रीमन्, आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। आप चले जाइये गांवों में, मैं गांव का रहने वाला हूं, मैं एक गांव में पैदा हुआ हूं, आप जाकर आज

भी देखिए, श्रीमन्, शिक्षा मंत्री जी, मैं समझता हूं कि आपकी कड़ी दृष्टि हमारी बातों की तरफ जायगी, आज गांव की क्या हालत है। शिक्षा मंत्री जी, एक तरफ तो 85 से 90 प्रतिशत ऐसे स्कूल हैं जहां पर कि छप्पर है तो टाट नहीं है, टाट है तो दीवाल नहीं है, दीवाल है तो छप्पर नहीं है, छप्पर है तो कुर्सी नहीं है। ये करीब करीब 85 फीसदी गांवोंकी हालत है जहां पर कि देश बसता है। देश दिल्ली ही नहीं है, देश कलकत्ता बम्बई नहीं है। श्रीमन्, कलकत्ता और बम्बई के शहरों में जब एक तरफ हमारे जैसा आदमी जाता है। 15-20 साल पहले डाक्टर राममनोहर लोहिया के चरणों में मुझे देश के भ्रमण का मौका मिला था। डाक्टर लोहिया कहीं जाते थे दिखाते थे, कहते थे कि देखो इसको सीमेंट की सड़क कहते थे, इसको कंक्रीट की सड़क कहते थे, इसको किसानों की सड़क कहते हैं, यह किसानों के बच्चों के पढ़ने के लिए स्कूल हैं। ट्रेन से दिखाते थे कि ये गांव के बच्चे पेड़ के नीचे पढ़ रहे हैं। बम्बई शहर में मुझे एक बार सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ उनके साथ जाने का, वहां पर सबसे पहले बड़ा होटल है उस होटल को उन्होंने दिखाया। उस होटल में जब उन्होंने हमको चाय पिलाई तो वहां का बैरा अंग्रेजी में बोलता था, हिन्दी में नहीं बोलता था। एक स्कूल में भी उनके साथ जाने का मौका मिला, ऐसे तो कई स्कूलों में जाने का मौका बाद में मिला। तो श्रीमन्, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक तरफ 85 से 90 प्रतिशत लोगों के बच्चे वहां पढ़ते हैं उन स्कूलों में पढ़ते हैं, जहां पर कि आज भी अध्यापक नहीं है, छप्पर नहीं है और एक तरफ उन स्कूलों में उन्होंने हमको दिखाया जहां कि गर्मियों के दिनों में ठण्डा और ठण्ड के दिनों में गर्मी रहती है। ऐसे स्कूल जिस देश में बने हों, इस ढंग से जहां पर—

आप भी बैठ जाइए आपको दो बातें मैं सुनाना चाह रहा हूँ, आप भागे जा रहे हैं। आप जाइए कोई बात नहीं लेकिन मैं आपको सुनाना चाहता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) :
आप चेयर को सम्बोधित कीजिए।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : क्योंकि आप लोग शिक्षाविद हैं। तो श्रीमन्, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि डाक्टर लोहिया कहा करते थे कि पाकेट का मालिक आज देश का बनिया है और दिमाग का मालिक पंडित है। आज इस देश का मालिक इकानामिकली बजट का मालिक बिड़ला या चन्द चार घराने है जिनका जिक्र मैं रोज हाउस में सुनता हूँ? जब उद्योग की बात आती है तब सुनता हूँ, जब शिक्षा की बात आती है तब सुनता हूँ दिमाग की बात, श्रीमन्, सरकारी रिपोर्ट मैं लाया हूँ, आपके सामने प्रस्तुत करने के लिए, यह कोठारी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है, कोठारी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के दो अंश अगर आप कहें तो मैं पढ़कर सुना दूँ लेकिन समय कम है शायद शिक्षा मंत्री जी घबड़ा जायेंगे। कोठारी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में—यह हिन्दी वाला संस्करण है पेज नम्बर 285 पर देखेंगे इसमें लिखा हुआ है—पंडित जी आपसे मैं आग्रह करूँगा आप काशी के रहने वाले हैं, आप भी मंत्री रहे हैं, आपकी भी सरकार 30 वर्ष तक रही है...

श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी : शिक्षा मंत्री भी रहे हैं।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : आप शिक्षा मंत्री भी रह चुके हैं मुख्य मंत्री भी रह चुके हैं। तो श्रीमन्, इसमें पेज 285 पर लिखा है कि 85 प्रतिशत स्कूल ऐसे बने हैं जो करप्शन और भ्रष्टाचार के अड्डे हैं। मैं पेज नं० 285 से कोट कर रहा हूँ कि जो बड़े लोगों के बच्चों

को पढ़ाने के लिए स्कूल बने हुए हैं, वह करप्शन का ही नहीं बल्कि वहाँ सारी एंशो-इशरत के साधन भी उपलब्ध हैं।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : इसको पढ़ दीजिए।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : काहे को पढ़वायेंगे। टाइम कम है। दो चीजों को मैं दिखाना चाहता हूँ। यह मेरे द्वारा प्रकाशित पुस्तक नहीं है। यह भारत सरकार के विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग की पुस्तक है। इसमें 105 विश्व-विद्यालय हैं जैसा कि आंकड़ों के द्वारा मालूम होता है। उसके अलावा भी हम समझते हैं कि दस, पन्द्रह या बीस इंस्टीच्यूशन हैं जो यूनिवर्सिटी के बराबर हैं। आज इन यूनिवर्सिटी में क्या है। उद्योग का मालिक, जैसे कैपिटल का मालिक बिरला, टाटा घराना माना जाता है, उसी तरीके से शिक्षा का अग्रणी भी वही इस देश में बैठा हुआ है। शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में पंडित लोग यानि विद्या के पंडित, जाति से नहीं। जाति से भी पंडित का अर्थ लगा लिया जाए तो इनका वर्चस्व कायम है। एक तरफ ऐसी नीतियाँ चलाई गई कि इन विश्वविद्यालयों में आज तक एक भी हरिजन वाइस-चान्सलर 105 यूनिवर्सिटीज में नहीं बना है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक भी अगर कहीं बन गया हो तो मैं नहीं जानता। लेकिन हरिजनों की बड़ी दुहाई हमारी भूतपूर्व सरकार के लोग देते हैं कि हरिजनों की हम तरक्की चाहते हैं। जब से हम मंत्रिमंडल में आए हैं और यहाँ का वातावरण जब मैं देखता हूँ तो मुझको ऐसा नहीं लगता कि यहाँ सबसे बड़ा अधिकारी कोई हरिजन होगा। मगर शिक्षा के ऊपर यहाँ बहस हो रही है, तो श्रीमन्, यह शिक्षा से वास्ता रखता है।

मैं यहाँ दिखाने के लिए एक ऐसी पुस्तक भी साथ लाया हूँ जिसको भारत सरकार के एज्युकेशन मिनिस्ट्री ने प्रकाशित किया है।

[श्री रामेश्वर सिंह]

श्रीमान्, हमारे मंत्री जी संस्कृत का बहुत बड़े विद्वान हैं, पुरातत्व के भी बहुत बड़े विद्वान हैं। यह पुस्तक भारत सरकार के द्वारा प्रकाशित है "संस्कृत इंस्टीट्यूशन इन इण्डिया"। एक तरफ कहा जाता है कि हरिजनों के बच्चों को पढ़ाने के लिए उनकी फीस माफ हो, उनके लिए भी स्कूल बनें। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि जब इस देश में प्राइमरी स्कूल से लेकर यूनिवर्सिटी तक जब संस्कृत की पढ़ाई की व्यवस्था है तो यह करीब 3600 के संस्कृत के विद्यालय या विद्यालय कहिए, विद्यालय एक ऐसी वर्ण व्यवस्था के लिए कायम है जिसमें कि एक जाति के लोग पढ़ते और पढ़ाते हैं? क्या शिक्षा मंत्री जी हमारी बातों की तरफ ध्यान देंगे, ऐसी नीति क्यों? मेरा तो कहना है कि आपने आलरेडी आरक्षण किया हुआ है उन घरानों के लिए जो पांच हजार वर्ष से इस देश के लिए कोढ़ बने हुए हैं, पांच हजार वर्षों से इस देश की नीचे गिराने में लगे हैं, पांच हजार वर्ष तक छूप्राछूत को फैलाने में लगे हैं। हालांकि पंडित जी अग्रणी हैं। पंडित जी ने जाति-पाति को छोड़ दिया। इनके बच्चों का अन्तरजातीय विवाह हुआ है, अन्तर राष्ट्रीय भी हुआ है। पंडित जी इस मामले में आगे हैं। मगर वर्ण-व्यवस्था एक ऐसी व्यवस्था है और मंत्री महोदय जी इसी स्कूल को अब क्यों चला रहे हैं? इसी इंस्टीट्यूशन को अब क्यों चला रहे हैं जबकि विद्यार्थी नहीं हैं, या तो वह भैंस चरा रहा है, या गधा है शादी-विवाह कराने, या गधा है कथा बॉंचने, मगर उसका नाम इस स्कूल में लिखा हुआ है, पाठशाला में लिखा हुआ है और शाम को आकर उसको हाजिरी भर दी जाती है—पंडित जी हाजिर है यह उसमें भर देते हैं और यह पुस्तक मैं लाया हूं और श्रीमान्, यह पुस्तक आपकी सरकार की प्रकाशित है, इसको मैं आपके सुपुर्द करता हूं। आप खुद भी अपने प्रकाशन विभाग से इसे मंगा लीजिए। तो कहना यह है कि यह जो व्यवस्था है कि इस

विद्यालय को आप पुस्तक भी देते हैं और 50 रु० से लेकर 350 रुपए वेतन भी देते हैं, उनको स्कालरशिप भी देते हैं, और यही नहीं, जब ऊंची नौकरी की बात आती है तो इन्हीं महा पाठशाला से निकले हुए विद्यार्थी, अध्यापक जो निकलते हैं वे ईक्वल टु० एम० ए० उनको मान कर बड़े विश्वविद्यालयों में उनको सविश देते हैं—यह किस की देन है? यह भूतपूर्व सरकार की देन है। उस सरकार ने इस व्यवस्था को कायम कर रखा है कि जिससे एक है तरफ जातिवाद पनपे और दूसरी तरफ देश का गरीब नीचे आए और देश में आतंक का वातावरण बने। श्रीमान्, यह मैंने आपको इसलिए याद दिलाया कि एक दिन ऐसा आएगा कि यह भूत आप के सिर पर चढ़ कर नाचेगा।

श्री अनंत प्रसाद शर्मा (बिहार) :
भूत का है तो वतमान की बात भी कीजिए।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैं जनता पार्टी की सरकार को अग्रह करना चाहूंगा : 30 वर्ष जो शासन कुशासन करने पर समाप्त हो गया, कहीं आप भी उसी रास्ते पर चले तो दो-चार साल में समाप्त नहीं जायें *Interruption*) इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ, आपकी सरकार ठोस नीति बनाए, हम लोगों की राय लेकर बनाए। गांवों के लोगों की राय लेकर बनाए, जो ग्रामीण जनता है उनकी बातों को जान कर बनाए। ये साफा बांधे हुए जो लोग यहां खड़े हैं उनकी राय लेकर शिक्षा व्यवस्था चलायें—ये महाशय यहां से बोलकर, अंग्रेजी में बोल कर, चले गए, मेरी बात कैसे सुनेंगे। ये चाहते हैं इनका आधिपत्य जवाहरलाल नेहरू यूनिवर्सिटी कायम रहे, ऐसे ही लोग चाहते हैं कि काशी विश्व-विद्यालय पर कब्जा बना रहे। शिक्षा मंत्री बड़े पंडित आदमी हैं, काबिल आदमी हैं, मैं ट्रेजरी बैंक का आदमी हूँ लेकिन कहने से चूकूंगा नहीं, सत्य को कहना पड़गा। शिक्षा मंत्री जी, आपने विश्वभारती का बिल तो ला दिया मगर बनारस

हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी का बिल अभी तक न मालूम किन खण्ड में पड़ा हुआ है; सुन्दर वन के खण्ड में पड़ा हुआ है या बंगाल की खाड़ी में पड़ा हुआ है या कहीं बनारस में पण्डित जी के पैर तले दब कर तो नहीं पड़ा है ?

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : पण्डित जी से क्यों बोलते हो ?

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : आप सारे बिल लाते चले जा रहे हैं और यूनिवर्सिटी को बरबाद करते चले जा रहे हैं जहां पर रोज दंगे और उपद्रव हो रहे हैं। अगर आप चाहते हैं विद्यार्थियों का जीवन सुधरे तो ला एण्ड आर्डर ठीक होना चाहिए।

श्रीमन् मैं उस जिले का रहने वाला हूं जहां लोग सत्तू खाते हैं, जहां के लोग चूहे खा कर पेट पालते हैं—इन हाउस में बता रहा हूं—श्रीमन्, आप आश्चर्य करेंगे देवरिया और बलिया...

श्री देवेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी : ये चूहे खाने वाले, जिनको आपने कहा बनारस से होते हैं, आप यह बताइए क्या आप बनारस की बात कर रहे हैं या बलिया की बात कर रहे हैं।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन् मैं आपको बताऊं, जन्म हुआ है मेरा बलिया में...

श्री कलर नाथ राय : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, रामेश्वर जी के गांव के लोग चूहे खाते हैं, बनारस के नहीं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) : आप विषय पर आइए।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : तो मैं उस जिले का बता रहा हूं कि उस इलाके के लोग चूहा आज भी खाते हैं। सत्तू नहीं मिलता है लोगों को खाने के लिए। यह 30 वर्षों की देन है,

आपकी सरकार की देन है। आपकी सरकार ने शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में इस मुल्क को जितना बरबाद किया है हम समझते हैं जनता पार्टी की सरकार में हम आए हैं, हम भी जनता पार्टी के हैं, हम चुनाव घोषणा-पत्र भी लाए हैं...

चुनाव घोषणा पत्र में आपने क्या वायदा किया है। आपने यह वायदा किया है कि उन सभी छात्रों को छात्रवृत्ति मिलनी चाहिए कि जो उसके पात्र हैं। अनुसूचित जाति तथा जनजातियों के परिवारों को शैक्षणिक अनुदान मिलना चाहिए। यह भी आपने कहा निरक्षरता दूर करने की बात भी आपने कही और आपने यह भी कहा है कि आप पब्लिक स्कूलों को बन्द करेंगे। श्रीमन्, हम लोगों ने कसम खाई थी कि इस देश में पब्लिक स्कूल हम बन्द करेंगे। लोग कहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी का खात्मा करेंगे। हमारे मित्र कुछ चले गये हैं, मगर आप हैं बंगाल के। मैं चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान की भाषा, राजभाषा बंगला बन जाये। इसमें मुझे एतराज नहीं है। तमिल बन जाये तो मुझे एतराज नहीं है, मगर इस देश से अंग्रेजी का हमेशा हमेशा के लिए खात्मा होना चाहिए। मगर पता नहीं कि जनता पार्टी और जनता पार्टी की शिक्षा नीति कहां जा रही है। जनता पार्टी की शिक्षा नीति वहीं जा रही है जहां 30 वर्ष तक पंडित जी की सरकार रही। वह जिस काम को करती रही, उसी काम को आप करना चाहते हैं। तो आपसे हमारा रिश्ता शायद ज्यादा दिन तक चल नहीं पायेगा। सीधी सादी सी बात है। (व्यवधान) क्योंकि हमारे जैसे आदमी का आपके साथ रहने का कोई मतलब नहीं बैठता। (व्यवधान) क्योंकि हम लोगों ने अपने इस देश को बनाने के लिए अपने को बर्बाद किया। श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी ने—आप कल्प नाथ जी अब बोलियेगा मत, श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी ने बीस हजार नौजवानों को, जिनमें इंजीनियर, डाक्टर, एम० ए० और पीएच०डी० भी थे इमरजेंसी खत्म

[श्री रामेश्वर सिंह]

होने के 6 महीने पहले मौत के घाट उतार दिया। ज्योति बसु की सरकार को जबरिया कब्जा कर लिया और वोट लेकर सरकारी पक्ष को कायम रखा। तो वह जुल्म की सरकार थी। हम जनता पार्टी की सरकार को जुल्म की सरकार नहीं बनने देंगे। हम जनता पार्टी की सरकार को भ्रष्टाचार की सरकार नहीं बनने देंगे। हम जनता पार्टी की सरकार की शिक्षा विहीन नीति नहीं चलने देंगे। यह चुनाव घोषणा पत्र मैंने आपको सुनाया है।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : चिट्ठी पढ़ो।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, अब मेरे कुछ सजेशन हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) : अब आप संक्षेप में कहिये।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : मधु लिमये की चिट्ठी पढ़ रहे हैं क्या ?

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, मेरे कुछ सजेशन हैं और मंत्री जी से मैं बहुत आग्रह के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे इनको मानें क्योंकि मैं बहुत दुखी हूँ। और मैं ही दुखी नहीं हूँ, कल से बनारस से मेरे पास तीन टेलीग्राम आए हैं। चारों तरफ यूनिवर्सिटिया बन्द हो रही हैं। पंडित जी ने कहा, सही है कि चारों तरफ यूनिवर्सिटियां बन्द हो रही हैं क्योंकि आपकी शिक्षा नीति दूषित रही। आपकी शिक्षा नीति गलत रही। तीस वर्ष तक जो शिक्षा नीति चली है उसका परिणाम जनता पार्टी की सरकार को भोगना पड़ रहा है। यदि आज विरोधी पक्ष चाहता है, माननीय पंडित जी चाहते हैं कि तीस वर्ष के जमा कूड़े को तीस वर्ष के कतवार को, तीस वर्ष की गंदगी को एक दिन में हम माफ कर दें तो यह भी संभव नहीं है, मगर जनता पार्टी के मंत्री और जनता पार्टी की सरकार, मैं चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम मेरी बात पर जरूर ध्यान दें क्योंकि हम 1947 में ही समझ गये थे कि कांग्रेस पार्टी

की सरकार जहनुम में जायेगी और आज जनता पार्टी की सरकार को भी हम समझ रहे हैं। मंत्री लोग वही उत्तर दिया करते हैं कि जो भूतपूर्व कांग्रेस के मंत्री दिया करते थे। मैं यह उम्मीद इस सरकार से नहीं करता हूँ। (ध्यान) कुछ सजेशन मैं आपको देना चाहता हूँ मैं शिक्षा मंत्री जी से और आप से बहुत नम्रता के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि मैं गांव से आया हूँ, मैंने बताया कि मैं उस इलाके से आया हूँ कि जहां पर आज भी लोग चूहे खाते हैं। मैं उस इलाके से आया हूँ कि जहां पर लोग अभी भी गोबर के अन्न से, पशु बैल के गोबर से जो अन्न निकलता है उससे जीवन यापन करते हैं। वहां के लोगों को वह जो अन्न मिलता है। वह जयप्रकाश नारायण जी का इलाका है। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि पंडित जी की सरकार ने भी पूर्वी जिलों को उपेक्षा की दृष्टि से देखा और आपकी सरकार भी हमारे पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश के लिए कोई ख्याल नहीं कर रही है। हम पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में जब कोई विकासशील कार्य करने की बात करते हैं तो जनता पार्टी की सरकार भी नाक-भौं सिकोड़ने लगती है। आप बनारस चल कर देखिये, मैं शिक्षा मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि वे हमारे साथ बनारस चल कर देखें, 13 करोड़ रुपये का घोटाला बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी में हुआ है। उसकी जांच नहीं हुई। डा० श्रीमाली के जमाने में बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी में यह 13 करोड़ का घोटाला हुआ था जिसका मैंने रहस्योद्घाटन किया था, लेकिन उस पर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया।

आज भी मैं हाउस में कह रहा हूँ कि 13 करोड़ रुपये का जो घोटाला श्रीमाली के कार्यकाल में हुआ है उसकी जांच होनी चाहिए। श्रीमाली ने 20 नौजवानों को मौत के घाट उतरवा दिया। श्रीमाली ने सारी यूनिवर्सिटी की मान्यतायें तोड़ दीं और सारी परम्पराओं को तोड़ कर यूनिवर्सिटी को बरबाद कर दिया। श्रीमाली ने बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी को तबाह करने के लिये

यह कह दिया कि यहां के लोग उजड़ होते हैं, यहां के लोग गुण्डई करते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि आप भी बंगाल के रहने वाले हैं, मैंने दस साल बंगाल में राजनीति की है, मुझे पता है कलकत्ता यूनिवर्सिटी में कितना उमड़व होता है, वह मुझसे छिपा हुआ नहीं है। आप हमारी यूनिवर्सिटी की ओर ध्यान लगाकर बैठे हुए हैं, कलकत्ता यूनिवर्सिटी पर आपका ध्यान नहीं है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) :
कृपया समाप्त करे।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, मैं अब कुछ सजेशन देना चाहता हूं ...
(Interruptions)

श्री देवेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी : यह इनका पहला भाषण है। (Interruptions)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) :
भाषण बहुत हो चुके हैं पहले।

श्री देवेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी : यह मेजर स्पॉच है।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : 5 करोड़ का भ्रष्टाचार भी है उसमें जो जनता पार्टी पर है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) :
अब समाप्त करिये।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैं समाप्त करने जा रहा हूं और अपने सजेशन नोट करा देना चाहता हूं।

श्रीमन्, मेरा पहला सुझाव यह है कि संस्कृत पाठशालाओं में यह कंपलमरी कर दिया जाए कि 60 परसेंट हरिजन और पिछड़ी हुई अन्य जातियों के लिए जिस पाठशाला में रिजर्वेशन नहीं होगा उसकी मान्यता छिन जाएगी। उनको एड नहीं दी जाएगी। संस्कृत की पढ़ाई हो, मगर 60

परसेंट अदर कम्युनिटीज के लोग—मुसलमान हरिजन, ईसाई, पारसी—जो लोग भी पढ़ना चाहें उनको पढ़ने का उचित स्थान मिले और उनको प्रपोज़नेटली उसमें हिस्सा मिलना चाहिए नहीं तो ऐसी पाठशालाओं की मान्यता छिन जानी चाहिए। मैं नहीं चाहता हूं कि संस्कृत का विकास न हो, मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि संस्कृत जैसी प्राचीन भाषा को हमारे लोग न पढ़ें ... (Interruptions)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) :
बहुत हो गया। आप भाषण मत पढ़िये सूब गिना दीजिए।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैं अपने सुझाव नोट करा दे रहा हूं। श्रीमन्, पहले नम्बर का सुझाव मेरा यह है कि शिक्षा की बुनियाद प्राथमिक शिक्षा होती है। (Interruptions)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) :
आप पूरा पढ़ रहे हैं। बहुत समय लग रहा है। समाप्त कीजिए।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : श्रीमन्, शिक्षा की बुनियाद, प्राथमिक शिक्षा को सर्वमुलभ, सर्वमान्य और समान किया जाये। इसके लिये आवश्यक है कि पब्लिक स्कूलों को बिना किसी दुविधा या पूर्वाग्रह के बन्द किया जाये। हमारी पार्टी के चुनाव घोषणा पत्र में भी कहा गया है कि अभी तक पश्चिमी शिक्षा पद्धति की नकल की गई है जो बहुत खर्चीली है। दुख का विषय है कि इस दिशा में आज तक कुछ भी नहीं किया गया। यह एक सामान्य सच है कि बिना पब्लिक स्कूलों को बन्द किये स्वदेशी गुलामी से मुक्त नहीं हुआ जा सकता, न ही कलम और कुदाल की दूरी को खत्म किया जा सकता है। इसके लिए आवश्यक है कि लोक शिक्षा की एक ऐसी समान स्कूल पद्धति का विकास किया जाये जो देश के सभी भागों के लिए हो, जिसमें स्कूल शिक्षा की सभी अवस्थाएँ सम्मिलित हों। इससे कोई

[श्री रामेश्वर सिंह]

भी व्यक्ति अपने बच्चे को इस पद्धति के बाहर किसी अन्य शिक्षण संस्था में भेजने की आवश्यकता नहीं महसूस करेगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) : इतना लम्बा भाषण आप पढ़ रहे हैं, आप पाइंट्स कहिये।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : हमें आप 3 मिनट दे दीजिए। मैं समाप्त कर रहा हूँ।

श्रीमन्, मेरा सुझाव दूसरा यह कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा के सन्दर्भ में प्राथमिक शिक्षकों को भी देखना होगा। आज ग्रामीण विद्यालयों के शिक्षकों को देख कर दया का भाव उपजता है। उनका रहन-सहन, जीवन-स्तर उठाना होगा। शायद तभी उनकी रुचि शिक्षण में होगी। इसके साथ ही प्राथमिक शिक्षकों की योग्यता भी ध्यान देने योग्य है। अधिकांश ग्रामीण शिक्षकों का ज्ञान इतना भी नहीं होता कि बच्चों के विकास की उनसे अपेक्षा रखी जाए। ये शिक्षक स्थानीय राजनीति, घरेलू कार्यों में फँस कर रह जाते हैं।

7 PM

मेरा तीसरा सुझाव है कि लोकभाषा में शिक्षण व्यवस्था। शिक्षा का माध्यम लोकभाषा होनी चाहिये। गुलामी की प्रतीक अंग्रेजी के मोह से मुक्त होकर हिन्दी और क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं को शिक्षा का माध्यम बनाया जाये जिससे मेधावी छात्र ऐसे स्कूलों में अपनी योग्यता के बल पर प्रवेश पाने पर इसलिये न घबरायें कि वहाँ भाषा विदेशी है। भारतेन्दु हरिश्चन्द्र ने कहा था—निज भाषा उन्नति अहे सब भाषा का मूल...। अंग्रेजी और अंग्रेजियत से चिपकने वालों से इस प्रकार देश को निजात मिल सकेगी। यह दुखद स्थिति आजादी के इतने वर्षों बाद भी बनी हुई है कि चन्द अंग्रेजी के ज्ञानकर पूरे जन मानस पर पंजा कसते जा रहे हैं।

चौथा सुझाव है रोजगार पर शिक्षा पर। लाखों की संख्या में लगभग एक करोड़ है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) : आप कृपया समाप्त करिये।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैंने दो-तीन मिनट मांगें हैं। आप घंटी बजा रहे हैं। मैं अभी तक खत्म कर देता।

आवादी बढ़ रही है। हर वर्ष बढ़ रही है पढ़े लिखे लोगों की फौज। यदि यही रफ्तार रही तो भविष्य क्या होगा। इन शिक्षित बेरोजगारों का असन्तोष क्या रंग लायेगा? इस सन्दर्भ में यह स्मरण दिलाना उचित होगा कि डाक्टर लोहिया ने कभी अन्न सेना बनाने की बात कही थी आज उसकी सार्थकता समझी जा सकती है।

मेरा पाचवा सुझाव है प्रौढ़ शिक्षा के बारे में। यह अच्छी बात है लेकिन शिक्षा के नाम पर सिर्फ दस्तखत करना ही न सिखाया जाए जैसा कि आज तक हुआ है। वरना उसी तरह से धन का अपव्यय होगा जैसा कि पहले हुआ है और शिक्षा का कोई मतलब नहीं रह जायेगा। प्रौढ़ शिक्षा के नाम पर पहले काफी धाघलियाँ हुई हैं। आज भी उसकी सम्भावना से इंकार नहीं किया जा सकता।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) : आप कृपया समाप्त करिये।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : इसलिये इस कार्यक्रम में विशेष सावधानी बरतने की आवश्यकता है। इस योजना से पढ़े लिखे बेकार लोगों को आंशिक रूप से रोजगार दिया जा सकता है, लेकिन देखने में यह आ रहा है कि इस योजना में ऐसे लोगों की घुसपैठ शुरू हो गई है जो कहीं न कहीं लगे हैं।

मेरा छठा मुझाव है कि संस्कृत शिक्षा के नाम पर करोड़ों रुपये खर्च किये जा रहे हैं लेकिन परिणाम वही... 'वही रफ्तार बढ़ेगी जो पहले थी वो अब भी है... सरकार पता लगाये कि इतने रुपयों का क्या हो रहा है। महोदय, मेरी जानकारी के अनुसार इसमें काफी गोलमाल किया जा रहा है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) : आप अपनी बात को दोहरा रहे हैं। कृपया समाप्त करिये।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : पता चला है कि फर्जी नामों से उपस्थिति लिखा कर छात्रवृत्ति और अन्य तरह की सुविधायें ली जा रही है। और इस तरह से सरकारी धन का दुरुपयोग हो रहा है। प्रसंगिक यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि संस्कृत शिक्षा में एक ही वर्ग का आधिपत्य क्यों है? हरिजन या दूसरे लोग क्यों नहीं? पठन और पाठन का कार्य एक वर्ग विशेष के हाथों चल रहा है और न जाने कब से चल रहा है ऐसा क्यों? क्या दूसरे इसमें रुचि नहीं लेते या उन्हें जान बूझकर बंचित रखा गया है। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा मुझाव है कि प्रत्येक सरकारी सहायता प्राप्त संस्कृत विद्यालयों में हरिजन और दूसरों के लिए कुछ प्रतिशत निर्धारित कर दिया जाय। यदि वहां ऐसा नहीं होता है तो उस संस्था की राजकीय सहायता बन्द कर दी जाय। और संस्कृत की पढ़ाई विद्यालयों में जोड़ दी जाये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) : कृपया समाप्त करिये। यह बहुत लम्बा है इसे आप मन्त्री महोदय के पास भेज दें।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैं सिर्फ एक मिनट लूंगा। सिर्फ थोड़ा सा ही है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) : एक मिनट लीजिए।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मेरा सातवां मुझाव है डिग्रियों की दुकानदारी के बारे में। आजकल समाचार पत्रों में ऐसे विज्ञापन देखने को मिल जाते हैं जिसमें घर बैठे डिग्री लेने की बात होती है। इस तरह की डिग्रियों को बन्द किया जाय। क्योंकि इनका व्यवहारिक रूप से कोई उपयोग नहीं। इस दुकानदारी में दुकानदार को लाभ अवश्य होता है, लेकिन खरीददार को कुछ भी नहीं हासिल होता। सिवाय एक कागज के पुलिन्दे के। यही नहीं मेडिकल के प्रमाण पत्र भी बेचे जा रहे हैं और धड़ल्ले से खरीददारी हो रही है। इन तथाकथित डाक्टरों का रोजगार गांवों में देखा जा सकता है। इन नीम-हकीमों से बढ़ रहे खतरे से सावधान होने की आवश्यकता है। मैंने उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के गांवों में देखा है ऐसे डाक्टरों का। जो सौ-पचास रुपये की डिग्री लेकर अपना कारोबार चल रहे हैं और लाचार आदमी उनके शिकंजे में फसता जा रहा है। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि ऐसे नामधारी डाक्टरों की प्रैक्टिस पर तत्काल रोक लगाई जाय और इस तरह की डिग्री बांटने वालों के कारबार को रोका जाये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री श्याम लाल यादव) : आप समाप्त करिये, नहीं तो मन्त्री महोदय को ये सारे मुझाव भेज दीजिए।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैं समाप्त कर रहा हूँ।

मेरा आठवां मुझाव है शिक्षा का स्वदेशीकरण के बारे में। भारतीय शिक्षा का स्वदेशीकरण किया जाये। आज का विद्यार्थी अपनी प्राचीन गौरव परम्परा को विस्मृत करता जा रहा है। प्राचीन भारतीय संस्कृति और सभ्यता को पुनः उजागर करने के लिये संस्कृति शिक्षा और प्राचीन साहित्य का प्रसार-प्रचार किया जाय। आज का विद्यार्थी पातंजलि, पाणिनि, भवभूति और कालिदास से अधिक जानकारी सेक्सपीयर, कीट्स, वायरन, वर्ड्सवर्थ के बारे में रखता है। मैं यह बड़े सम्मान से कह सकता हूँ कि हमारे

[श्री रामेश्वर सिंह]

रचनाकार किसी भी पाश्चात्य रचनाकार से कम नहीं है। लेकिन हमारी आंख पर पश्चिमी चश्मा यह देखने ही नहीं दे रहा है। यह रवैया बदलना होगा। यही मेरा आग्रह है।

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Sir, if there is any aspect of Government functioning which has shown a lack of proper direction and indefinite drift over the years, I think it has been the field of education. And here, perhaps, we cut across party lines when we say that this is one field in which the maximum experimentation confusion and frustration have existed irrespective of the State to which the students may belong. And it is as a result of this that we have all over the country what people have commonly come to call the 'teaching shops', commercially run institutions whose aim is money-making rather than the education of the child, where standards have fallen and where, perhaps, more than anybody else it is the student and the young mind which have paid the price. Little wonder, therefore, that wherever you go, you hear these days of student indiscipline and frustration, of drop-outs and of different types of student revolt.

There is no denying that over the last 30 years, a lot of effort has gone into the building of an educational system which would be both productive as well as acceptable to all sections of our people. But we have to remember that we inherited an educational system from the British and, unfortunately, it was that generation of our patriots who believed that there was no need to recast or change it overnight allowed this system to continue as it was. And let us not forget that the British established an educational system in this country not out of love for the people of this country but basically to produce a class of administrators which would suit the interests of the British empire in this country. It was

their intention to build a class of administrators as set apart from the common people so that they could continue to rule this country perhaps for another hundred or two hundred years. It was unfortunate that after Independence we believed that this imported Western pattern of education could suit the needs of this newly independent nation. I believe that this has been the fundamental point of difference or the fundamental complaint from the new generation that we are following a pattern which is basically an imported system. Of course, there have been other factors which have contributed to our problem. An uncontrolled growth of population threw all our plans for primary education out of gear. We have also had other impediments—social factors like the religious road blocks at various stages and the other problem of getting education for women equally accepted and as quickly as it was for the rest. Then there was the great, big problem of language. Lack of finance has always been an excuse as far as the Ministry of Education is concerned. It has been a permanent experience that whenever cuts have had to be imposed on budget allotment it is normally the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare which has been among the first to pay the price. Besides these, there have been conflicting factors in Indian society which we have tried, with great difficulty perhaps, to compromise. I would cite only two or three such factors.

We have accepted the socialist pattern of society as our national pattern of development. And yet what has been our experience on the educational front? It has been purely a class-oriented educational system. And here I feel very strongly that in a country which speaks about equality of opportunity, which speaks about all sections of the people having equal rights, we start the child at the primary stage at different levels of education. The rich have the public schools, the special schools and the best of our schools.

And yet the child of a class IV employee, the child of a scheduled caste citizen, the child of poorer sections go to the free schools, municipal schools, corporation schools where often textbooks are lacking, class rooms are lacking and, more often than not, the teacher is lacking. And yet we are talking about a society in which all have equal opportunities to appear for any examination, to get into the I.A.S. to go abroad or to become an expert. How do you expect to build a society on an equal footing when you start your child at the primary level at different levels of education?

We speak about a country, about a nation where everybody feels one and united and yet we have to give in to local pressures. We had education in the State list. And there came the question of local languages, local pressures, local interests, minority groups, and language groups. Every group has been accommodated with the result that we have failed to build today after 31 years of freedom a truly nationalist pattern of education in which all our young people could live and grow believe that they are one.

Then there is the conflict of whether emphasis should be on the rural child or the urban child; and unfortunately, in spite of all that has been said, the emphasis has always been in favour of the urban child. Everything in the educational system is weighted against the child in the country-side and yet we say there should be emphasis on villages because 90 per cent of our population comes from the rural or the semi-rural area. Now, in an atmosphere like this—I know we are running out of time—we have tried at different levels to do what best could be done. Free, compulsory, primary education has been the goal. But how far are we from our projected target?

It is true that my party's Government—at least I am proud of it—took a positive step in making education compulsory and bringing it on to the Concurrent List. I think this was the first ever effort at trying to get some kind of a national pattern established in this country. I believe that if you are building a new generation of Indians to be one, to be united, it is absolutely necessary that you have a common pattern of education for the entire country. An experiment was made earlier on the neighbourhood schools. It was, perhaps, one of the best things that could have been developed but because of pressures from different sides it was abandoned by the then Congress Government. I believe that if you want to build a new nation you have to start with primary education. You have got to have somehow a primary common syllabus for this country. After all, our history is the same. The geography of this country is the same. Our traditions are the same. Why can we not unite our children by these basic subjects, mathematics, history, geography, basic sciences? Why can we not have a common syllabus for the primary schools of this country? If my child comes to the North the while pattern is out of gear for him and he is absolutely stranded. If the child goes to Bengal you have something new altogether. Why should this happen in a country 31 years after independence? We are still groping to find a national pattern of education suited to our development.

One more thing which hurts me very much is the school uniform. We have seen this round the world. Irrespective of their school, private, public or whatever they are, they have a common uniform at the primary level. But here at the primary level, the moment you look at the child. You can distinguish a child on the road by his uniform. You can distinguish the social strata to which the child belongs, whether

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

he is from an exclusive school by looking at the uniform. And it is at that level everywhere that you are giving him a class distinction that there are different sections, different privileges and different norms for our little children.

As far as the figures are concerned—I do not believe in figures especially from the Government—they are misleading and you can quote them for your benefit or to prove something else altogether. No doubt, the figures show that as far as enrolment from class 1 to class 8 is concerned, we have gone up from 222.75 lakhs in 1950-51 to 845.38 lakhs in 1976-77. A very good record for our Government, no doubt. But you must also remember that these figures do not show the dropouts, and at this level the dropout rate is so high that to think that so many children have really been educated in that period is absolutely misleading, because the dropout rate at this level is the highest that there is in this chart.

Now, as far as teachers are concerned, I would like to say that here again the best teachers get the best salaries, going to the best schools, with the result that the not-so-well-paid teachers are left to the ordinary students—I would say the poorer students; I would use this word because that is how our schools system is built. Therefore, I would say, let the Government think in terms, at least, of a uniform salary for school teachers. I know it is difficult but there should be something by which teachers, whether in private schools or public schools or Government schools get at least a common salary scales so that there is no discrimination between your Government schools, private schools and the richer schools.

As far as science and technology is concerned, it is a tragedy that the new Government has, somehow or the other, begun, as a policy, to shift its

emphasis from what had been really the national goal, perhaps, one of our real aims in this country, of making this country scientifically and technologically self-reliant. Over the last few weeks or months we have seen some of our top scientists absolutely ridiculed as, being guided by political considerations in their research, and different national institutions of research and technical development disbanded or made absolutely to feel like secondary institutions. I mean, this new atmosphere which you are creating in this country is going to further increase the brain drain. Your young people do not lack nationalism. They want to be part of the development process in this country but if you, I don't mean you alone but if we people, who are in a position to give them this sense of belonging and security, fail them, it is but natural that they will go to others. And you have seen many of them rejected here go abroad and then be invited as heroes by us once they make their mark in foreign universities or foreign countries. Is it not a disgrace that our young people have got to go abroad to be recognised, to be made to feel wanted, to be given the opportunity and then to come back and say, "Well, I started as an Indian but I had to go away because I did not have the opportunity?" And I feel that the present policy of saying, "Well, technology is not important; industrialisation was Nehru's fad; we do not need this; we are to go back to the village; we are to go back to agriculture" will not help us. Right, go back to the village, go back to agriculture, but at least build agricultural universities. What is your outlay, at the moment, for agricultural universities, for rural universities, for the development of even your traditional handicrafts? What is the emphasis you are giving in your schools and your educational institutions? You talk one thing and you do something else. As the speakers before me had pointed out, even in the past our educational development has been lopsided. Emphasis has been on higher education when you could not absorb these people

into jobs for which they have been trained and yet, at the primary level the expansion has really not been broad-based.

I feel that this Government is now going to reorient its educational policy to making imported technology more acceptable and, the export of scientists more paying. As far as medical and engineering colleges are concerned, it is true that there is a scramble for seats. Private colleges, even in my State and many other States, are charging exorbitant capitation fees. They get students in upto a certain point where merit is recognised; the rest are given opportunity through very heavy capitation fees; and there is nothing you can do because it is literally blackmarketing of seats in the country. And yet I feel, what you need today is doctors. I do not want you to copy the system of barefoot doctors as I am not obsessed by the China syndrome like many other fellow-politicians are these days.

DR. V. P. DUTT: Now they have started wearing shoes. They have been ordered to wear shoes.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: They are wearing shoes: they are no longer barefoot doctors; okay. But why can't we get people picked up from the rural side, trained for rural services themselves? I do not want doctors from Bombay, Calcutta and Madras, or engineers, to go and work in the rural side. It is difficult for them to readjust.

But there young people, intelligent, dedicated young people, in the rural areas. Even for the Adult Education Programme I am certain that the people who will be taken for this purpose are those from the cities, from the universities, the unemployed engineers and graduates and they will be asked to go to the rural area for adult education. This is the trouble. We do not pick up the local talent and train them for the local programmes. If this would be done, there would be

no unemployment in the cities, and there would be no shift of population from the rural side to the cities.

Now the other question is about the language. I am not a fanatic as far as language is concerned. I speak, read and write Hindi. It was my second language in the university long before anybody thought of fighting it in the South. I want to say that language can make and unmake an educational system. If today there is this fear in the country that Hindi is going to be pushed, then, you will see that the students in the South, as a reaction, will stop studying the language altogether for the simple reason that nobody wants to do a thing when compelled to do it. But I ask you, Mr. Education Minister, while we in the South have learnt Hindi with a great effort, I want to know in how many of your schools in the Hindi Speaking States you have introduced languages from the other parts of the country and made them compulsory for them?

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: Ask Panditji.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I would have asked Panditji had he been the Education Minister. Is it fair to make our children learn more languages? And some of the minorities speak their own languages. If you want the language policy to succeed, you must give the students in the Hindi-speaking areas a language other than that of their own State. Only then there will be the feeling that we are all learning together and sharing the burden together equally. I will give my own example. I have my own children studying in Delhi. I had to bring them with me when I was elected to Parliament. The language in my State is Kannada, and I would certainly like my children to learn Kannada because they have to go back there. When I asked in Delhi,

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

I learnt that there was only Sanskrit. There is no Kannada. They must learn Hindi and they must learn Sanskrit. What use is it to my children? But, no. Your policy is like that. There is no opportunity even to learn their own language in Delhi. They must go to the school and learn Hindi and Sanskrit to keep your local regulations.

As far as the Adult Education Programme is concerned, I am a member of the Adult Education Board, and I do not want to offer any criticism here because I can offer it in the meetings of the committee. But I would say that you lay emphasis, not shift completely from the primary school level to the adult level because I know that ultimately it would be a question of funds. And I would say here very honestly that if you have to choose in your allotment of funds between 0-14 age-group and 15-30 age-group, let us build the new generation with complete educational facilities provided and let us not deprive the new generation of this age, that is the under 14 age group. At least let us start at that stage and see that the next generation in this age group is educated completely.

The question about the involvement of the R.S.S. in the Adult Education Programme has been raised. I would say, Mr. Minister, I have also been concerned by what I have been reading in the free Press. It has been reported in the "HINDUSTAN" *saptahik* that the Secretary of the RSS himself has made a statement that they have been asked to run the adult educational programme in a big way and that they would do it with determination under the able guidance of their leader, Mr. Deoras. Now, even if they are helping in this programme, I do not think that it is proper for any organisation to give the impression that they are masterminding or leading this whole programme of adult education. It may create immediately a reaction and a

certain amount of hostility from the general public. I would plead with you, therefore, to correct this misimpression and to see that non-political organisations, the university students, the local organisations and others come in and not to let the people think that the public money is being given to the organisations like the RSS to run the Adult Education Programme in the country.

I just want to take two minutes more. You are looking worried already, Sir.

I would like to emphasise one or two points. One is the question of the 10+2+3 system, about which there has been so much discussion and so much debate. I would plead with you: please don't think that this was a brainwave of the previous Government and so it must be undone. I think there is a lot of sense in that system, not because it came as a proposal from my Government but because I believe that indiscriminate admission into the universities in their thousands and millions and their coming out with paper degrees solves no problems either for the students or for the parents or for the nation itself. I am happy that after 10 years of general education, there will be two years of vocational training for the students. This has been done in other countries. And this belief that one has to get a degree and get a white-collar job and sit at the desk and mark files is something which we have to remove because we need technicians. In fact, as far as trained man-power is concerned, we stand third in the world today and we are proud of it. Let us train our young people to do something concrete rather than just get a B.A. People come to us for jobs. So many of them come pleading for jobs. What can you do? I can do nothing if a person merely gets a B.A. and comes to me and asks for a job. Even if he has passed only the High School examination, if he has a certificate in shorthand and typing, you can absorb him

somewhere. But what can I do if he is just a B.A.? I cannot make him a clerk and get him employed somewhere. There is need not so much for degrees but for emphasis on technical education after ten years in school. This is something which will solve many of our problems. Then, let our education become more and more job-oriented. This was talked about for 30 years, but we seem to be nowhere near getting at it. But your announced programme that within 10 years—one-and-a-half years are already over—you will be able to solve the unemployment problem in this country, puts a special burden on you to reorient your education policy to see that it becomes job-oriented, because I hope you also do not think that election promises are only for the manifesto to the forgotten. People believe you are going to do it. But we find that in all these 18 months, you have not even started drafting a programme by which you can make your so-called employment policy in some way connected with your education policy.

Now, I hope I won't sound partisan, but I am the only woman speaking today and so I have to say a word about women's education. There is no denying the fact that in 1975 a lot was talked, a lot was promised, a lot was said about making women's education a little more priority-oriented. As it has been rightly said, you educate a man and you educate an individual; but you educate a woman and you educate a family. So women's education is a primary importance today in this country. The dropout rate among girls particularly in the lower income groups and particularly in the rural side is very high because the girl has to look after the young ones at home when the mother is away at work. Therefore, the need is somehow to relate your educational institutions—the Labour Minister is here—with that of setting up creches for children of working mothers. This is very important. I had raised this question earlier.....

DR. V. P. DUTT: The Labour Minister comes here only to hear you. He does not come here to hear anybody else.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Don't be jealous. I would just like to say that it would be very necessary somehow to relate creches, particularly in the rural side and in working areas, with the primary schools so that the elder girls when they go to the school can leave the children in the creche to be looked after. Otherwise, with all your allotments, with all your plans, the girl at the primary school level is going to be a permanent dropout and permanently backward as far as education is concerned.

Then, just a word about the need to emphasise development of sports and cultural activities along with our education. I do not think this point has been touched at all by anybody. I believe that sports are something which this country has got to emphasise a little more within the educational system which has till now been neglected the most. You have educational institutions without even a 6 sq. yd. plot in front of the institution where the children can gather for an assembly. The need to have a common play ground in different areas where children can go and play, is of very great importance. And then introduction of yoga as a means of physical fitness is also necessary. Yoga has got a great tradition in this country and it needs little plan. It should be introduced at the primary school level.

Finally, what I want to speak about is the trend of political interference in the universities which we have noticed over the last few months about which members have already spoken. I very often wonder with whom the Government is. On the one hand they claim to be with the students, and on the other hand they say that discipline has to be restored and so everything has got to be changed. When the Delhi University took a stand about discipline and students were punished, two Ministers of the

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

Union Government led a delegation to the President to plead that their cases must be reviewed. Ministers of the Government of India leading a delegation of students who have been rusticated by the University does not speak well for the Government or for anybody concerned. And then you have heard about the Jawaharlal Nehru University; you have heard about the fate of even teachers of the History Congress. Why is there this new trend to try and control even history teachers and their interpretation of history? What are we heading for in this situation? Finally I would like to say that education is not really the building, or everything else that you put into it; education is judged by the end-product of the process. What are we training our young people today for? Why are our moral standards falling? Why is it that public life itself has gone into disrepute? It is because there is not enough emphasis in our educational system, on character building, on nationalism, on a sense of service to the nation above oneself. And unless this is inculcated in our youth through our educational system, no amount of outlays, no amount of educational reforms and no number of dedicated Education Ministers can change anything in this country. Thank you.

श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी : मान्यवर, यह कब समाप्त हो रहा है ?

श्री उपसभापति : अब मन्त्री महोदय उत्तर देंगे ।

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Can you not give me five minutes?

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: I would request that Mr. Madhavan be given just five minutes at least.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All the parties have exceeded their time-limits.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : थोड़ा थोड़ा समय सब को दे दिया जाये ।

श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी : सदन का समय है 11 बजे से 6 बजे तक । और समय बढ़ाने के लिये यहां कोई रेजोल्यूशन भी नहीं मूव हुआ कि समय सदन का और बढ़ाया जाय और सदन बढ़ता चला जा रहा है । तो आखिर यह कब तक समाप्त होगा ।

श्री उपसभापति : माननीय मन्त्री महोदय से मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि वे उत्तर दे । बहुत समय हो चुका है ।

श्री प्रताप चन्द्र चन्द्र : कमलापति जी से मैं कहूंगा कि मुझे भी तो कुछ वक्त उनको देना चाहिए । इतने सवाल उठे हैं । उनका कुछ जवाब तो देना चाहिए । यदि आप चाहें तो मैं जवाब न दूँ ।

श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी : आप जवाब दें, लेकिन सदन का समय बड़ा देना चाहिए, नहीं तो समाप्त करना चाहिए (Interruptions)

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have for over five hours patiently listened to the various suggestions and points of criticism made by several honourable Members of the House. But when we say education is very important, it seems that this importance is not reflected by the presence of Elders in this House, because I have counted the heads and I find that not even ten per cent of the honourable Members are present. Anyway, when the respected Leader of the Opposition is there I am expected to address you, Sir. Since you are present, I am certainly to address you and express my point of view.

Some of the hon. Members have criticised us on the ground that we are undoing whatever had been done in the past or we are trying to change the national consensus and so on. I

would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members that even in the national policy on education which was adopted in 1968 and which has been referred to in this House is clearly mentioned at the end that the Government of India will also review every five years the progress made and recommend guidelines for future development. Therefore, this national consensus was not final. Every five years such a review should have been made, but it was not made. It took ten years. Now, when we undertake such a review and if we suggest some guidelines for future development, it cannot be said that we are undoing the national consensus or we are undoing whatever was done in the past. We are actually following the national policy on education. This has been reviewed and some of the reports of the review committee have been placed here. Others have taken place at different levels and we are preparing the new national policy on education which was placed before the Ministers' Conference. Then a copy had been sent to the various States and many of the States have considered the draft national policy. They have expressed their views. But many want us to give them more time for this purpose. I thought I shall be able to place the new draft policy before this House and the other House in the course of this session. Now many States have written to us saying that they would require more time to consider this matter. So, I am very sorry it will not be possible for me to place the new national policy in its draft form before this House during this session. However, it is not true to say that we have no sense of direction. It is rather wrong to allege that we have not indicated our priorities. In fact we had indicated them as early as the 5th April, 1977 when I made the statement on this both in this august House and in the other House. We are relentlessly and ceaselessly pursuing on the basis of the priorities that we have set before us. Therefore, it is not correct to say that we have no sense of direc-

tion or there is confusion. This type of allegations and statements are not borne out by facts.

But some of the hon. Members have praised this—Development of Higher Education in India—a Policy Frame as prepared by the University Grants Commission. They have praised it and I thank them for that. At least they had some word of praise for the work of an institution which is with us and which is being financed by us either directly or indirectly, whatever it may be. When they praised this policy statement here, they mentioned about double standards set in the educational system. Then they praised adult education, universalisation of elementary education, secondary education and vocationalisation. What is new in this book? It is entirely based on the priorities which we had set earlier last year on the 5th April, 1977. Therefore, what this book says is more or less the substance of what we have indicated. So, when they criticise us by saying that there is no sense of direction, I would submit that this apprehension should not be there. We are not only having a sense of direction but we are trying to implement it in a systematic manner. What is the system we are following? We have discussed the various aspects of our policy at different levels and we had series of meetings with educationists and representatives of various bodies, both educational and non-educational, and we have consulted even representatives of political parties in connection with adult education programme and connection with student unrest.

So, we are trying to meet the cross-section of the viewpoints so that we can formulate such a national consensus. Then, Sir, we are providing for funds for the priorities that we have set before us and, as I have told you earlier—some of the honourable Members also have said about it earlier we have set our priorities for the first time in such a clear fashion and herein lies the difference in our approach and the approach of the previous Government.

[Dr. Pratap Chandra Chunder]

We have said that we have the first priority for broad-basing education in our country. That is to say, we want adult education and we have a time-bound programme for making ten crores of adults literate in five years' time. Now, how can we do that unless there is proper allocation of funds? As the honourable Member, Dr. Zakaria, has pointed out, funds are important. So, we approached the Planning Commission and I am glad to tell you that whereas in the last Plan only one per cent of the total Plan allocation had been provided for adult education, in this coming Plan, ten per cent has already been provided for and more will be forthcoming if we can show results. Is that not an achievement at least in the matter of our approach and in the matter of a realistic assessment of the situation and a realistic step towards the solution of the problem? Similarly, we have said that primary education should be universalised. Various figures have been quoted and I have said about that on the 5th April last year and, in order to help in the implementation of this aspect, we have approached the Planning Commission and I am glad to tell you that the Planning Commission has increased the fund allocation in the plan from 32 per cent in the last Plan to 50 per cent in the present Plan. Is that not a proper and realistic approach towards the solution of the problem? Now, the point is that we have to tackle the other fields also. Mention has been made of the drop-outs. We know that there are drop-outs because of poverty and because of various other factors. So, we are also formulating schemes of non-formal education for these drop-outs so that we can solve this problem also and we want to shift our emphasis, as has been very well made out by Mrs. Alva just now. In the past, there was the class-oriented education and we now want to make it a mass-oriented education. This is a very big shift in our policy and this we are backing up with the provision

of adequate funds for the purpose. I do not say that it is completely adequate. More funds would help us more. But what has been provided by the Planning Commission is certainly a definite improvement in this field. Now, what is the modality of implementation? Many of the honourable Members have criticised us saying that the Government is doing nothing and that there is a lot of corruption in the schools and so on. They have also said that dilapidated school buildings are there and so on. Now, who is responsible for running a school? Under the Constitution, it is the State which is responsible for running the schools, for schools education, and the Central Government is responsible for providing standards in respect of university education or higher educational institutions. Similarly, educational institutions under the school system are run by the State Governments. So, whatever policy we frame, we have to take the State Governments into confidence in respect of that policy. So, what we have done in this field is that we have consulted the Ministers of the States, not once, but twice. Last year, the Ministers met and they have by and large approved of our approach. This year also the Ministers have met and they have given their stamp of approval on almost all the points except in formulating the national policy on education because they wanted more time to consider the matter in all its details. But, in the matter of formulation of the policy in a broad manner, there is not much of a difference and, you will remember, Sir, that when we speak of the State Governments, it is not the State Governments run by same political party as it was the case during the previous regime. Now, we have broad spectrum of all the political views in the administration of the States. So, when we try to get the approval or help of these State Governments representing the view of the Congress (I) or the Congress or the Communists or the Marxists or the

National Conference or the Janata or the various other local parties also in the eastern States, that indicates really the national consensus which was not present in the past. So, when these Ministers agree on broad principles, on the broad matters of principle, we can take pride in the fact that here is really the national consensus when the broad spectrum of the various political units holding different view have considered the broad plan of education and they have given their stamp of approval to this.

Now, with this end in view, we are proceeding at the grass root level. We are sending our officers to different States to talk to the Education officers of those States individually. There have been meetings of the Chairmen and Secretaries of the Boards of Secondary Education, and I have attended that meeting twice, so that we can convey our ideas so that people who are at the level of execution of those ideas at the State level will certainly carry out these ideas. Then, when I go to different States, I individually meet Chief Ministers and Ministers to discuss the various aspects of education so that the ideas are certainly conveyed to them and they can also give us their view points. And I can tell you that I am getting very good response from all the different Ministers in different parts of the country. Only the other day, I had been to Calcutta, and I had three hours' discussions with the Minister of the United Front who is in charge of higher education and adult education and all the Vice-Chancellors of the State had come. Now, these are some of the *modus operandi* which we are trying to follow so that our ideas can be implemented at the State level. I had similarly gone to Vishakhapatnam and I had a meeting with the Education Minister who belongs to Congress (I) party, and I am glad to tell you that we got very good response from the honourable Shri Venkatarama Reddy. And not only that. Today I find a news published in the *Patriot* which gives the view of Dr.

Chenna Reddy, Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, and what he says here in this report is exactly in the light of what I had said in 1977 before this august House. I had said that the reduction of load on the students should be effected, so that the children may have proper time to develop their total personality by taking part in sports, games, exercises and cultural pursuits. And Dr. Chenna Reddy has said the same thing. He had said that the curriculum in the schools would have to be changed to reduce the "donkey's load" of books which clutter their minds. Similarly, he also says that this would bring an effective change in the character of education and under this scheme the school would start at 6 in the morning with prayer, yogic exercises, and that school children will be given free meal, etc. So we are getting results and we are getting response from the various State Governments.

Sir, I have a big file with me which deals with the reactions of a large number of States but because there is not much time, I do not want to go into details. Many States have accepted in writing the policies that we have adopted, and others have taken some time to consider. So, by and large, I can say that the policy that we have adopted has got proper response from different parts of the country. But the details are being worked out. And I shall present the details before this House in the coming session.

Now, let me indicate to you how we want the change. I have already said that our first priority is to broad-base our education. That is why we have this adult education programme. Now, many criticisms have been made about the involvement of RSS and other groups or politicalising the issue. Now, if I remember correctly, there was a Conference in 1965 organised by the UNESCO held at Teheran, and it was decided by the Ministers coming from different parts of the world that no policy of adult education can succeed unless there is political will behind it. To have this political will, I have not

[Dr. Pratap Chandra Chunder]

only consulted a large number of groups like teachers' organisations, students' organisations, voluntary agencies, workers' organisations, but I have also consulted leaders of political parties. And all of them have agreed to accept this programme and to start this programme. But when we were formulating the details, we came to the conclusion that this adult education should not be simply adult literacy just to teach these adults the 3R's.

It should be linked up with our developmental process. In other words, it should be a composite integrated education so that the adults are motivated and they get something out of the great change which is going to take place throughout the country. In the coming Five Year Plan, there will be rapid development in the rural areas and if the adults do not take part in this developmental process and, at the same time, if they are not educated, then there will be a hiatus between the two and the nexus will not be established. Therefore, in consultation with the Planning Commission, it has been decided that at the level of adult education, 350 hours will be allocated for each adult in a year. Out of these 350 hours, 200 hours will be for adult literacy and numeracy and 150 hours will be allocated for education in health, in agricultural matters, in acquisition of some skills, in games etc. so that the total personality of the adult can be developed through education, the adult becomes a link in the matter of development of rural areas and he takes legitimate pride for his part in rural development. In the matter of education of women, I can assure Mrs. Alva that nearly 62 per cent of 10 crores, i.e. nearly 620 lakhs, will be women adults. That is the scheme. But how to implement this scheme? We cannot implement from Delhi the adult education scheme throughout the country which is spread out in different parts starting from the most eastern to the most western and from the northern-most to the south-

ern—most part we have to take the State Governments into confidence. Therefore, it has been decided that, even when the voluntary agencies are to be employed for this purpose, the selection of the voluntary agencies will depend on their clearance from the State Governments. Whether it is R.S.S. or a Communist organisation or a Muslim League organisation, we have indicated the guidelines. There should be no direct participation in political propaganda and no discrimination on the basis of race, sex, caste, colour or creed. Then, we have also said that in these matters the main role of the political parties will be to have the motivation and to create a climate in the matter of field work. We would like to have registered societies or trust bodies, but all these will not be selected by us directly at the central level. It will be done by the State Governments and if a particular State Government actually nominates certain parties or selects certain parties and sends them to us, then we will certainly have the option to consider whether these bodies satisfy the guidelines of non-communal approach, democratic approach, non-violent approach, etc. We have a right to check whether they satisfy all these things and only then we will provide funds to these bodies, not directly but through the State Government again. This has been the decision of the Education Minister's Conference. Therefore, the fear that we are paying so much to a particular organisation is absolutely wrong. We have not paid to that particular organisation up till now. Whatever we have paid is to the registered societies which have been recommended by the State Governments. Under the coming programme which we have undertaken, we will depend on the State Governments. In other words, there will be a sort of partnership between the Central Government and the State Governments because according to the financial provision also, the Planning Commission says that 50 per cent of the adult education expenses should be provided by the Centre and 50 per cent by

the State Governments. Therefore, in the matter of choice also, the State Governments will have their say. That is the position. So, whatever apprehension is there, I do not think it is borne out by facts.

But I can say about the RSS that they are really dedicated people, and Prof. Rashiduddin Khan has also said that the RSS has actually done a lot of good work. Whether they believe in ancient traditions or not, I think we all believe in our ancient traditions. Why shouldn't we have faith in our own past? Why shouldn't we have patriotism? Therefore, it is not a fault if a particular group or followers of certain organisations have faith in the past, faith in the glorious tradition of India. Why should we de-nationalise ourselves? We have not gone to that length. However, this is neither here nor there.

Now, Sir, about the various other points which have been raised, I would like to point out that there is no scope for pessimism as Dr. Dutt has mentioned. If we have pessimism, then we cannot work. We have to work with optimism. May be, we will succeed, we may not succeed. But that does not matter. But if we give vent to our pessimism, then we will be immobilised and no change can take place in the country. I have optimism. I have faith in our people. I have faith in the administrators at the State level, in our own officers, in the officers of the State Governments, in the administrators of different States. And I am getting good response from many of them. So, I should humbly request Dr. V. P. Dutt to get rid of this pessimism and in that case, he will find that he himself will come forward to help us in implementing the programmes that we have undertaken.

DR. V. D. DUTT: I am prepared to do whatever I can.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: That is most welcome. That

suggestion is very welcome. And Mrs. Alva is also in the National Adult Education Board. We expect much from them because it is not the task of the Education Minister of India or any political party alone. A single political party cannot do anything. After all, here we do not believe in one party system. Here we have plurality of parties. Everybody should be involved in this, in creating the atmosphere, in creating the motivation so that we can succeed in this process. Now, Sir, that is the first priority.

Sir, the second priority has been to change the contents of education. Dr. V. P. Dutt has listed a number of statements that he has made concerning the changes he wants in the educational pattern. And I can assure him that most of the suggestions that he has already made or he has repeated today are incorporated in the pattern which we have undertaken. So, when we change the contents of education, we want to make education related to life. Here again is a very significant change. Earlier, education was more or less bookish in character. But we tried to change the pattern of education, and this Review Committee, that is, the Patel Committee's Report indicates how we propose to do that. Here, you will notice that in the lower classes, in the primary classes, we have one language, not too many languages. Then mathematics, then environmental studies, which Dr. V. P. Dutt has already mentioned. Then, Sir, even from the lowest class, we have involved the new element of socially useful productive work, that is to say, even from class one, the children will start with that concept of socially useful productive work. It is not a simple work experience. But it is some work with hand which is related to the good of the community. It may also be services like propaganda in the matter of health and sanitation or it may be for growing something in the fields attached to the school so that it may be useful for the community, and animal husbandry and

[Dr. Pratap Chandra Chunder]

what not. Similarly games and creative activities such as music, dancing and painting. In other words, even from the lowest class, a comprehensive education is sought to be given which would try to develop the total personality of the child.

8 P.M.

Now, let us turn to the next group of classes—five to seven or eight as the case may be. Here also, we have language for seven hours, mathematics for four hours, history, civics and geography together for four hours, science and integrated course for four hours. And it is not correct to say that we are dismissing science from the course of our study. That is absolutely wrong. We are not. But we are trying to make science more intelligible to our children so that they can really take something out of this. So, science is there. Then, arts, music, dancing, painting—three hours, and socially useful productive work and community service—six hours. Then, games, physical education and supervised studies—4 hours. Thirty-two hours is the total workload in a week.

Now, when we come to the next group, classes 8 or 9, on the one hand, and up to 10, languages, mathematics, science, history, civics, geography and then certain options are given; but socially useful productive work community service still find an important place as also games, physical education and supervised studies. In other words, the content which we want to place before our people will be comprehensive content. It is not lop-sided content as has been suggested by some of the hon. Members. We are not doing away with science. We are certainly having games, as Mrs. Alva just now pointed out. At every stage, games, a physical education are made compulsory. So, these are some of the problems that will have to be solved and how to solve them, much will depend on the co-operation we get from different States.

Now, a question has been raised about the problem of higher educa-

tion. We shall have more opportunities to discuss this matter when we take up the Report of the UGC. In the case of the higher education—here also—, we find that the UGC has indicated one important change in the field of higher education. What they have suggested is that there should be an extension project for all university students and teachers, so that they will be involved either in the adult education work or some other developmental work, which is also an innovation in this field. The UGC is framing detailed schemes for this purpose and we are finding that from class 1 onwards up to the higher studies at the university level, the students will generate a new social commitment so that they will not be isolated from the society and the present alienation which exists between the students and the society will be done away with, if we are able to implement the programme that we are laying before this House.

Now, Sir, in the course of the debate, and apart from that also, certain detailed questions have been asked. For instance, this problem about the Jawaharlal Nehru University was mentioned. Now, you will notice, Sir, that the Prime Minister took up this task of making some preliminary inquiry into the matter in certain serious situations which had developed in that particular university. On account of the students' demonstrations the university had to be closed down and students were demanding the resignation of certain officers of the university. So, the Prime Minister went out of his way to save the situation and, instead of thanking him, I am surprised that some of the hon. Members are criticising him. It was not his business. He need not have taken up this matter on himself. In spite of his heavy preoccupations, he offered or volunteered his services to make a preliminary inquiry into this matter, he has taken great pains to get the report from the university, the complaints from the people, and,

on the basis of these complaints to get an answer from the university and after that he had come to certain conclusions: but still it is a preliminary report and it has been sent to the Ministry for processing. This is being processed and it may be that we need not have to make the formal inquiry with the help of the Visitor. It may be, that the university authorities themselves can see reason in this suggestion and the university authorities themselves may change some of the patterns which had been criticised at different levels. Therefore, it will help us to save a large part of our time and other complications in the running of the university. Instead of supporting the Prime Minister's stand, I am surprised that very respectable academicians like Dr. V. P. Dutt, or Dr. Rasheeduiddin Khan, have criticised it. I do not think there is any harm in this. It is not a commission like the Shah Commission. In fact, certain matters concerning the university are still before the Shah Commission as also in the case of Delhi University. Therefore, we are trying to see how best we can solve the problem of this university without going into the great deal of formalities. Nobody has been dismissed; nobody has been asked to go. It is not correct to say that the Vice-Chancellor has been asked to go. In fact, when the matter was discussed with the Prime Minister, the Vice-Chancellor himself felt that in that situation, possibly, he might resign. However, he has not resigned. He has gone to Canada to attend the conference of the Commonwealth Vice-Chancellors. Therefore, I do not know why there is so much of furore in the university circles. We are not going to do away with the autonomy of the universities. On the other hand, in the Bills that I am bringing before this House and the other House—this Viswa Bharti Bill or the Aligarh Muslim University Bill and in future I will bring other Bills also relating to Banaras Hindu University and other

universities—I am trying to give back democracy to the universities concerned. These universities had been, in the past, more or less packed bodies consisting of the nominated members. I had to nominate some of the members to some of these universities. I do not want that. I do not want to grab power. I want to give real autonomy to these universities and with the help of the hon. Members we will certainly succeed in doing so. So, this is not correct to say that we are doing away with the autonomy of the universities. Where was this talk of autonomy when during the emergency more than 200 teachers of Delhi University had been arrested without trial and sent to jail? At that time there was no talk of autonomy. Some of these hon. Members who are waxing so much in favour of autonomy, were keeping silent before the power that be in those days. So, today it is rather funny to hear from them so much about autonomy. We really believe in the democratic system; we really believe in autonomy. Therefore, we are not only trying to uphold the autonomy but we are trying to restore the legitimate autonomy, the academic autonomy to these universities.

DR V. P. DUTT: Sir, we are seeing that legitimate autonomy in the JNU.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: Sir, in the JNU also, some of the students were whisked away from the institution (*Interruptions*). Some of the teachers were also whisked away

DR. V. P. DUTT: Because the Vice-Chancellor has been asked by the Prime Minister to give resignation. Sir, he is misleading the House.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: Dr Dutt will not like it certainly because it is not going to be palatable to him....

DR. V. P. DUTT: Nor will it be palatable to you.