

**MOTION RE REPORT OF  
THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS  
COMMISSION**

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES (PROF. V. K. R. V. RAO) : Mr. Vice-Chairman. I beg to move the following motion :—

"That the Annual Report of the University Grants Commission for the year 1967-68, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 12th March, 1969, be taken into consideration."

The report, Sir, was placed on the Table of the House nearly six months ago. We were not able to have it discussed during the Budget session on account of want of time.

But we have now tried our best to bring up the discussion as early as possible after the placing of the Report on the Table of the House. I am sure Members by this time would have had an opportunity to go through the Commission's Report.

I propose with your permission not to make any speech myself. I think it is far better for me as Education Minister to listen to the comments and observations that the Members might have to make on the points contained in the Commission's Report, and at the end I might make my observations on any suggestions that may come from the Members.

With these remarks, I beg to move that the discussion may be taken up on this Motion.

*The question was proposed.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Now I would request the hon. Members to confine themselves to 15 minutes so that more Members may be able to participate in the discussion. Mr. Krishan Kant.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : I am glad that the hon. Minister of Education has kept his promise to the House and brought this Report for discussion at the earliest possible time. This Report is there. But I have a feeling that it will be of no use merely to comment on this Report. I think it is time that we considered what is the

real impact the functioning of the University Grants Commission on the system of education, on our social conditions, on the social upheaval that is going on. These facts and figures may be correct and some interpretation can be given to those facts and figures showing that so many schools and colleges have been opened and so much grant has been given. It is all right, and in the discussion we can generally say that more money should be given to the Commission. Of course, education being the basic productive factor in the country, more money always needs to be given to education. But I think the time has come when we must consider the basic issue—whether the purpose for which the University Grants Commission was established has been fulfilled or not, what has been the impact of the functioning of the University Grants Commission on solving the various social tensions. There are riots in the country either communal riots or labour riots or riots on the border question, or there is some trouble in the universities, and we find the gap between the generations. And every time we think that the only way out is to improve our educational system so that the generations can catch up and we will be able to build up a new society. This is the basic aim of education, to build a new man. And we have to see whether the University Grants Commission has/Hgri really able to produce such citizei this country who will be able to contribute not only in regard to the productive aspects but also in the establishment of a new social order, a new socialistic system in this country, which we want to build up. It is for the Minister of Education, when he replies, j to say not only as to how much money | has been spent, that so much has been j done, that so many schools and colleges have been opened but also what is the impact of all these things. Has education really contributed to the achievement of the objectives which we had before us when this University Grants Commission was established? Mr. Vice-Chairman, you know that the Radha-krishnan Commission and the Kothari Commission have said that in spite of the improvement in education all round, education should be remodelled. Why is it so? The system remains there despite many changes. The Chairman of the University Grants Commission said in January, 1969, as published in the Statesman, that the pattern of university education in India today is similar to

the one which existed in London University in 1857. This is what the Chairman of the University Grants Commission feels about it. It the Chairman of the University Grants Commission who has been there for a number of years should feel so about it, we have to really find where really the lacuna is. Has the University Grants Commission been able to fulfil all the functions for which it was established? Has there really been co-ordination and improvement in the standard of education? I do not think that during all these years any effective step has been taken to really co-ordinate education in the various States. Of course, we have the Inter-University Board, we have the Central Board of Education, the State Education Ministers' Conference is being held off and on. But what is the impact? What is the use? It seems that there is something basically wrong in our functioning, may be in our approach. Even now, the country has not been able to establish one co-ordinated system of higher secondary education or pre-university education. We have not been able to decide whether the schools should have 12 plus or 11 plus classes. The basic thing is that we are unable to coordinate the system of education all over the country. It may be, as the hon. Education Minister says, that it is a State subject and we have not much right about it. But the basic question remains because on the pattern of school education depends the university education, so, one of the biggest failures is that there is no coordination up till now. And I do not know whether they are really incapable of doing this coordination or not. If they are not, then something should be done in this respect.

Another thing to which I want to draw the kind attention of the House is whether the University Grants Commission has really served its purpose as a policy direction organisation. Has it been able to introduce a new fervour among the students? "Has the atmosphere become really academic or has it become merely a routine type of education where there is no dedication, no desire for creating new, dedicated men in this country? So, my feeling is that policy guidance to education has not been there. The University Grants Commission itself has become a pawn in the whole bureaucracy, it has become a sanctioning authority in the allocation of funds for this purpose or

7—45 R.S./69

for that purpose. Even sometimes when the allocated funds are not given they have to pass budgets even in regard to sweepers and chowkidars. This is the Junction of the University Grants Commission. The whole idea of creating a separate Commission was not to bureaucratise education. That was why a separate Commission, full of educationists, was created. But has it been really able to create an atmosphere in the country? Has it not itself become a pawn in the hands of the bureaucrats? When the University Grants Commission (Amendment) Bill came here, at that time I pointed out that even the amending Bill that they had brought forward was the product of some bureaucrats. They wanted to have some bureaucrats from here and there. I would like the hon. Minister to look into the matter and tell the House whether the University Grants Commission is really a body which inspires the students and the teachers to create a better education and atmosphere, one which could create new type of students who could be good citizens of this country. Has any evaluation been done in this respect or is the University Grants Commission merely controlling over the purses and trying to boss over sometimes? I know about Dr. Kothari, he is not of that type, he is temperamentally different. But it seems that one person is sitting there and roundabout him the machinery is different. I do not know how anybody can function in that sphere. What the University Grants Commission has been doing is only administering education and it is not geared to the new thought-process, for the policy direction for which it should function. I would like the hon. Minister, while replying, to say whether it has really given this direction and, if so, what is the result.

One of the important functions of the UGC is the raising of the standards of education in the different fields, in different subjects. Has any evaluation been done to find out whether the standards have risen in different subjects. Some friend of history told me this morning that the teaching of history was as bad as before. This Report says that some evaluation has been done. In the Commission's Report it is said of committees, performance and the syllabus, that different books are being put up. But still what I have understood is that only in economics and in some of the science subjects have the standards gone up really high.

[Shri Krishan Kant]

But in other subjects the standards have not gone up. So has the Government or the University Grants Commission any method of evaluating the standards of different subjects, and what is the result? Have they really improved or not? Of course, because of democratic functioning in this country and because of parliamentary democracy having its way more and more people want to go to schools, colleges and Universities. There is a great demand for schools and colleges. But along with quantity may I know if the quality has increased? The final paragraph of this report also mentions :—

"Within the resources available, the Commission has made attempts to meet the challenge of the rising student enrolment, on the one hand, and the urgent need to improve the quality of higher education, on the other. In spite of the paucity of resources, there has obviously been a significant increase in the volume and diversity of education efforts at various levels."

But about quality the final paragraph is silent. Of course, a great advance has been made in quantity but not in quality, and unless the quality improves the real citizen of this country cannot benefit. I know they have been trying to have summer schools and programmes of seminars. But the teachers who go there are not worth the salt to give direction to the students who go there. The summer schools have not been able to fulfil the objectives for which these schools were created.

Not only this, what has happened to the standards of University education? Now it has come to such a pass that an eminent University like the Banaras Hindu University, of which I was very proud, is not in demand any more. Some of the organisations like the Tatas mention in their advertisements for jobs that students from the B.H.U. need not apply. That shows what impression people hold about the B.H.U. What about Shantiniketan? After independence it was repley expected that their standard would go up, and the atmosphere should have gone up with the advent of freedom. New type of people should have come out of that University. May I know whether the hon'ble Minister of Education, who is an educationist himself and who has

his pulse on the feeling about the academic atmosphere, is satisfied with the standards of Shantiniketan? Is the atmosphere and the environment there as inspiring as it used to be earlier?

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated) : May I ask a question? Have you any reason to believe that the standards in the Shantiniketan and the Visva-Bharati have gone down? Have you visited this University?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I have been told by people who have come from there,

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : I am on their Executive Committee. I go there twice or thrice in a year. May I tell the hon'ble Member that the standards have not fallen.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : They have not gone up.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Krishan Kant says that the standards have not gone up.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : You are suggesting that it has not improved. It has considerably improved.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : You can reply when your turn comes. But this is the impression which has gone all around. You may be satisfied with that. But the products which are coming out from there have got lower standards. The same thing holds true about Aligarh. It used to be a cultural centre. Have things now improved there? I am referring to these institutions because they happen to be Central Universities.

Coming to the States, the University position there is different and the position in affiliated colleges is again different. Though new scales of pay have been prescribed for them, they cannot be given to them. In spite of that the majority of students who go to different walks of life, come out of these affiliated colleges.

The basic point which needs to be looked into is whether there is a gap or not between the University atmosphere and the society around. Is it congenial? Have the Universities produced students who can fit into the society and make

it more useful and worth while? Our syllabii are sti I based on old classical standards. E'en mathematics, which had a good standard before independence, has got 2 down in its standards. Recently, I had been to Europe and there I saw s.ime special mathematics schools and alleges where young students were taught. Mathematics is the basic subject ( n which all sciences depend. Our s andards of mathematics after independence have gone down. Has any attempt been made to integrate the need of tie twentieth century technological culti re with the ancient culture so that Here is no friction and there is no difficulty in change-over? j Of course, theie have been lots of diffi- j culties in the European countries. But in this country when we are rebuilding, has that thing been done to meet the basic need of the modern times? What is required is he creation of a scientific spirit in this country. In this country or in the woild, unless there is the scientific spiri and scientific culture there mav not be homogenity with the men living in the society and social environment which is ever-changing because of echnological revolution. Attempts have been made in this direction in the iUniversities. Has really scientific culture developed in them? Has scientific spirit been imbibed in them? What I feel is that all students, whether of history or humanities or of science, should be taught the history of science. That itself will create a mental climate in th students when they are walking into he technological culture and technological society so that they know how much development has taken place, iio w the mental attitude ha«. to change and how the environment has to chang;. If the study of the history of set nee and some other subjects are made a part of the University education, it would be easier for them to walk into the new society that is being built uv without any friction. (Time bell rites.) T am finishing in a few minutes. There are two cultures— ancient and nodern as enunciated Tw Shri C. P. Sh ih. When we build a new society there is always a friction between these tv o cultures. With the heln of the Univc-sity Grants Commission we should se■■\* that that friction does not arise in his country.

Before closing, I would touch upon one or two points. The University Grants Commission gave a model Uni-versity Act. How many Universities

in the States or the Centre have really modelled their University Act on the basis of that? If they have not done, why not? After all, they have produced something. But nothing is being done. What is the Government going to do about this thing so that the standards of real education can not only be maintained but improved ?

One suggestion which I had given earlier is in order that our Universities should become really centres of knowledge rather than centres of literacy, they should create an academic atmosphere in this country. I do not know how far that suggestion can be implemented. It is worth trying particularly when University unions are growing. Students who attain excellence in particular faculties, they alone should be made Secretaries and Presidents of those faculties. That system alone will change the atmosphere in the Universities. As against this, today a person who can make the greatest noise and organise processions becomes the president of a faculty. I suggest the hon'ble Minister of Education should persuade the students' unions and the Executive Councils and the faculty unions that only students who attain excellence in their faculties should be made Presidents and Secretaries of those faculty unions. This will help in creating a new atmospnhere. These are some of the suggestions which I wanted to place before the honourable House.

श्री गनेशी लाल चौधरी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज मैं यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन की रिपोर्ट पर चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ। मुझे आज इस बात का दुःख है, जब मैंने यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन के सदस्यों की सूची देखी। उस समय मेरे मस्तिष्क में यह बात आई कि आज हमें आजाद हुए 20-22 वर्ष हो गये हैं और देश में जो विश्व विद्यालय की शिक्षा है वह एक बहुत बड़ उच्च स्तर की शिक्षा है और इन 20 और 22 वर्षों में एक भी आदमी इन विश्वविद्यालयों से शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट का और शिड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स का नहीं निकल सका जो कि यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन का सदस्य बन सके। मैं यह बात इसलिए कहता हूँ कि जब मंत्री महोदय इस बहस का जवाब देंगे, तो फौरन कह देंगे

[श्री गनेशी लाल चौधरी]

कि आज देश में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट का और शिड्यूल्ड ट्राइव्स का कोई भी आदमी इस योग्य नहीं बन सका, जो कि इस कमिशन का सदस्य बनाया जा सके। तो आज मुझे इस बात का बड़ा ही दुःख है। इसलिए मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह कहूंगा कि जब वे कमिशन बनायें तो उसमें गिरे हुए लोगों को, शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट तथा शिड्यूल्ड ट्राइव्स के लोगों का भी ख्याल रखें। मैंने इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ा। मैं देखता हूँ कि यूनीवर्सिटीज आटोनमस बाडीज हैं, जिनका कन्ट्रोल यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन के द्वारा होता है। हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में बोर्ड आफ हाई स्कूल एंड इन्टरमिडिएट एजुकेशन हैं, जिसके तहत हर क्लास में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शिड्यूल्ड ट्राइव्स के विद्यार्थियों की कुछ परसेंटज होती है, उनके लिए रिजर्वेशन रहता है, विद्यालय खुलने के 15 दिन तक वे जगहें सुरक्षित रखी जाती हैं। अगर उन स्थानों के लिए कोई शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और शिड्यूल्ड ट्राइव्स का विद्यार्थी नहीं मिलता, तो 15 दिन के बाद वे स्थान भरे जाते हैं। जब हम इन विश्वविद्यालयों में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स के बच्चों की भर्ती की बात करते हैं, तो यह कहा जाता है कि यूनीवर्सिटीज आटोनमस बाडीज हैं और वे खुद चाहें तो कर सकती हैं, गवर्नमेंट कुछ नहीं कर सकती है। इन विश्वविद्यालयों में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स के लड़कों को एडमिशन नहीं मिलता, विशेषकर मैं उन जगहों के लिए कह रहा हूँ, जो साइंस के, विज्ञान के क्लासेज हैं। मैं देखता हूँ कि जब कोई एडवर्टाइजमेंट निकलता है, तो पही मालूम होता है बाद में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स में से कोई भी विद्यार्थी, कोई भी कैंडिडेट नहीं आया, इसलिए वे जगहें नहीं भरी गईं। आज 20-22 बरस हो गए, हम एम्प्लायमेंट की पोजीशन को देखें। सरकार में केवल 2-3 परसेंट जगहें शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट एंड ट्राइव्स के लोगों को मिल पाई हैं जब कि उनका रिजर्वेशन इससे ज्यादा है। तो मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि जब वे यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन

के द्वारा इन विश्वविद्यालयों को कन्ट्रोल करते हैं, तो विज्ञान की कक्षाओं में, टेक्नोलोजी की कक्षाओं में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट एंड ट्राइव्स के विद्यार्थियों के लिए स्थान सुरक्षित करें और जिस तरह से बोर्ड आफ हाई स्कूल एंड इन्टरमिडिएट में 15 दिन तक स्थान खाली रहते हैं, उसी तरह विश्वविद्यालयों में इन विद्यार्थियों को स्थान दिया जाय। अगर वे ऐसा नहीं करेंगे, तो देश का एक तबका कभी भी उस स्टैंडर्ड को प्राप्त नहीं कर सकता और नौकरियों में जो उनके लिए रिजर्वेशन है, वह पूरा नहीं हो सकता। मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री जी अभी कहेंगे कि वहां तो कम्पटीशन होता है और उस कम्पटीशन में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स के लड़के उस स्टैंडर्ड पर नहीं पहुंच पाते, जिससे कि वे विज्ञान की कक्षाओं में भर्ती हो सकें। मैं उन्हें सुझाव दूंगा कि जिस तरह से आई० ए० एस० में भर्ती के लिए प्रिकोचिंग क्लासेज खुले हुए हैं, उसी तरह से इस बात का प्रावधान करें कि विज्ञान की क्लासेज में भर्ती के लिए प्रिकोचिंग क्लासेज हों। तब शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स के विद्यार्थी विज्ञान की क्लासेज में, टेक्नोलोजी की क्लासेज में भर्ती के लिए अच्छी तादाद में मिल सकते हैं। मेरे खयाल में आप उस तरफ गौर करेंगे।

मैंने यह भी देखा है कि जैसे दूसरी जगहों में सर्विसेज में रिजर्वेशन है, यूनीवर्सिटीज के पर्सनल में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स का कोई रिजर्वेशन नहीं है। इतनी यूनीवर्सिटीज हैं, लेकिन मुझको एक आदमी नहीं मिला शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स का जो किसी यूनीवर्सिटी का वाइस चांसलर हो। कोई भी टीचर या अध्यापक आज शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स में से नहीं मिलेगा। मैं जानता हूँ उनके आफिसेज में शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स के लोग नहीं मिलेंगे। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि जहां पर शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स का रिजर्वेशन न हो, उन यूनीवर्सिटीज को ग्रांट बन्द कर दें और कहें कि जब तक वे शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स एंड ट्राइव्स के

लोगों को अपने स्टाफ में या अपने आफिस में रिजर्वेशन नहीं देंगे, उन्हें नौकरी नहीं देंगे, तब तक हम तुमको कोई ग्रांट नहीं देंगे। इस तरह से आप करेंगे तो शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के लोगों को, गिरे हुए लोगों को आगे बढ़ने का मौका मिलेगा और हम देखेंगे कि सविसेज में देश के कांस्टीट्यूशन के मुताबिक उन्हें जो रिजर्वेशन मिला हुआ है और जो अभी तक कम रहा है, वह जल्दी सविसेज में पूरा हो जायगा। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि जो मैंने सुझाव दिए हैं, उन पर गौर करें।

DR. DEBI PRASAD CHATTOPADHYAYA (West Bengal) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the interim Report of the University Grants Commission for the year 1967-68, I find, is confined to rather very limited subjects. But we are grateful to the hon. Minister for providing us an opportunity to discuss the matters which are directly related to the Commission's Report.

Now, when the Commission was established, and particularly when the Kothari Commission's recommendations were published, in the educational circles, there was a high expectation that there would be something done really this time. But we have gone through the successive reports, the interim reports, of the University Grants Commission and we are really sad to find that there are only some facts and figures, which are sometimes interesting but not very useful for knowing what is really being infused in the system of education. We find in the Kothari Commission's Report that the objective of education is transformation of society. Education has been conceived as the most mighty instrument for social transformation. So the success of the educational system has to be viewed from that larger, and I say deeper perspective—whether the system of education has succeeded in contributing to, or in accelerating, the pace of social development, to achieve a sort of social integration. Now, viewed from that perspective, I am sorry to say that the performance of the Commission towards the cause of education is really very poor. Now these general remarks may be supplemented by numerous details and I would refer to some of the details.

I First, I think the system of education that we have is an alienated system of education. Our system of education has not been conceived, has not been implemented, nor is there any contemplation for future implementation, having in view primarily our national needs and social requirements. Like our political system, it is largely a parasitical one, borrowed from the West. And this is one point which Gandhiji repeatedly emphasised before independence, that the sort of education that we will have after independence must be of such a nature that it must serve social purpose, it must be moving *pari passu* with our political progress. That way we should realise that our system has failed because it is alienated. Now, how our educational system is alienated may be shown in different ways. Yesterday we had a very important discussion on Ahmedabad riots. It might sound that this is rather irrelevant, but I think this is quite relevant. Mr. Ramachandran and Mr. Chagla very pertinently pointed out that there has gone something very wrong, deeply wrong, in the system of education. That is also relevant from the recommendations of the Kothari

Commission that unless education works as a sort of agency of integration, it is of no use, and that way, I say it has failed to work as an agency, as a sort of force, for achieving social harmony and social integration; it has failed because it is alienated.

It has not answered the requirements of the people. We remember that before independence whenever Gandhiji spoke, he spoke primarily of primary education, basic education. Nowadays we have concentrated too much on university education, college education. University and college education is no doubt very important. Nobody is going to deny that. But if you want to make education a mighty instrument of social transformation, then, it must affect the infrastructure of the society and in the infrastructure of the society what is most important is primary education. We have palatial buildings in different universities. I find that in the Viswa Bharati where there used to be huts during the time of Guruji, there are now very impressive and imposing buildings. There are very beautiful and magnificent buildings in the Banaras Hindu University, in the Jadavpur University also I find there are magnificent buildings. In the Calcutta University we have imposing buildings as show pieces, to show the foreigners.

[Dr. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya.]

Instead of showing the foreigners these palatial buildings, if you take them to our villages, what will they see? They will see a primary school for girls without the minimum arrangement for a toilet for them. This is really a sad commentary on the planners of our education. We say that education is a mighty instrument of social transformation, but in terms of both quality and quantity we have failed because the main quantum of the population, I mean, the people who should be sent to primary education, are being denied that privilege. So unless we concentrate on primary education, our main purpose of education is defeated and I fear it has been defeated.

Then, if we look at the problem from the point of view of quality, it is also really saddening. What is happening? Year after year thousands and lakhs of students come out of schools and get admissions in universities and colleges. But after their graduation course you find an enormous number of failures. Even after the post-graduation course we find an enormous number of failures. All this is a very sad reflection on the system of education. If students fail, we often blame them saying, "You have not minded your studies. You have minded rather your politics." One thing we have to answer ourselves. Once we admit our boys and girls in the universities and colleges, we take an implicit responsibility, a tacit acknowledgment, that they are fit to be admitted, and for three or four years we give them education. We teachers, are supposed to be qualified to teach them. But what happens after that? They get plucked in astronomical figures. It is again a reflection on the system of our education together with the people who run that system, I mean, the teachers like ourselves and the administrators around us. A large percentage of failure is a reflection on the system. Nowhere in the world so far as I know, neither in England nor in Europe, nowhere do the students, once admitted into the universities, get plucked in such large numbers. So, we should evolve some formula, lay down some criterion in terms of which we should decide the eligibility of students for admission to the universities. Simply because your boy has come through the Matriculation or the equivalent examination, *ipso facto* he does not become eligible for university education. Here the question should be

viewed in a larger perspective. You are aware that nowadays the universities are largely financed by the State. When they are financed largely by the State, you must remember that it is the people's money which is educating our children. In large numbers of students get plucked in B.A. and M.A., it is a wastage of the people's money. We should be very careful in judging whether it is a wise policy, whether it is a rational policy, to allow the boys take admission in universities and colleges simply because they have got through the Matriculation examination. Even in countries like Russia and China simply because the students have passed the Matriculation examination they do not give admission to them to universities and colleges. But curiously enough there is a tendency—is it progressive?—in our country that students are admitted to universities simply because they have gone through the Matriculation or the School-Final examination. So, we should look at the problem in a national perspective when national money is being spent on college and university education. We should see that the people's money is not wasted. But I fear it is being wasted.

Now, together with this problem of failure is tagged the problem of student unrest. A mediocre student somehow gets through the university course. I do not know much about other parts of India, but in the parts from which I come, Bengal, I find education nowadays has become farce. I say it is literally a farce. Largely widespread unfair means are being adopted and students get through their H.S. or S.F. and are allowed admission to university course. Then what happens? Expectation is roused in them that as soon as they get their degrees and diplomas, they get jobs. Naturally there is a sense of expectation in them. That expectation is sure to be roused in them. But if you see the job potentials today, I know, not all the students that are going to come out of our universities can get jobs. So, there is going to be frustration in them. So, we should be careful. Of course, there is frustration in either case. If you do not allow them into the University, then too they will feel frustrated. That is one level of frustration. But there is another very dangerous level of frustration. You think they are fit for admission to university courses. You rouse in them a sort of expectation that because they are highly qualified they will get higher jobs. But they are not getting them. The second

kind of frustration is very dangerous. It eats into the very vitals of our nation because the money is being spent for them for three or four years. And if there is a huge percentage of failure, it is a sad reflection on the system of our education. There is frustration, total frustration. The resulting unemployment situation is a shame not only for the educationists, but for the politicians and the statesmen as well. So, it is from that larger perspective that we should look at this problem.

Then I come to my next point. I should think that the students should have a sort of say in the administration of the university. What I mean is that they should not be mere spectators, but they should be actors in the drama of education. If you say, "You are indisciplined, you are defiant", that is not going to solve the problem. I think we should be good enough—and progressive enough—to realise that unless you somehow or other involve the students in the decision-making procedure, in the decisions which are likely to affect them, the student unrest problem cannot be cured. It may be suppressed for some time, but it cannot be cured. Unless the students are allowed to cuff themselves, unless their consent is taken in matters which affect them, they will always oppose whatever measures are proposed. So, in the governance of education the students should be allowed to have a proper say. In this matter I am glad to learn that the UGC and the Minister of Education are taking a liberal attitude.

Then there is another recommendation of the Kothari Commission which has not been implemented at all—particularly the recommendation regarding participation of the academicians, the teachers, in the governance of the university. Actually the universities are now administered by administrators who have little or no knowledge or experience in teaching. So, it is better that the centre of authority in education gradually moves in the direction of the academic wing from the non-academic wing. This recommendation was there, but it has not been implemented up till now. There was also another recommendation of the Kothari Commission—that the retirement benefits should be extended to the teachers. Under the retirement benefits being contemplated they suggested two principles. One they call the principle of uniformity. The second they call the principle of parity.

For the principle of uniformity they suggested that the benefits which are available to teachers of the Central universities, should also be made available to the teachers who do not belong to the Central universities. By the principle of parity, they meant, the benefits of the Government officers—gratuity, pension, etc.—should also be extended to the teachers. But I find nothing of the sort in this report about these salutary recommendations.

4 p.M.

So unless the benefits of gratuity and compensation are extended to the teachers, you cannot have a sort of education which will prove a mighty instrument for social transformation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You must finish now.

DR. DEBIPRASAD CHATTOPADHYAYA : I will finish it in two minutes.

Sir, it was also accepted by the Kothari Commission that the ratio of junior to senior posts in the universities should be 2:1. But you will find from the Report that is before us that still the figure is nearly 4:1. At the college level it is still more disappointing; it is almost 6:1. If the ratio is like that, then the juniors will surely be frustrated and they will always feel that they have no place in the upper cadres. When you go to England or America, you will find that the number of junior posts is minimum and the number of senior posts is maximum. But here in India the position is quite disappointing; it is surely likely to lead to frustration not only among the taught but also among the teachers. So I think something must be done in this respect as well.

I think I have some other points also but I would only refer to one point regarding the recommendations of the pay scales. I am sorry that these recommendations with regard to pay scales made in the year 1966 have not yet been implemented in many universities in India. What is more sad is that where they are implemented, they are not implemented in a regular way. What I mean to say is that the money from the UGC goes there but it is not disbursed monthly. So after three or four months some teachers get a lump



[Dr. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya.]

sum and there are universities where the difference due to increments and due to revision of pay scales—from 1965 till November 1969—has not yet been disbursed. There is a curious game about it. If we approach the Central Government, it says the matter lies with the State Government and the State Governments on the other hand say that the matter is lying with the Central Government. Last Session you will recollect that 1,500 teachers came down from West Bengal to Delhi saying that they were not getting their money regularly. It is really strange that over three years have elapsed, still the benefit of the revision of pay scales is not being given to the teachers on a monthly basis. It is really a sad state of affairs and it must be undone as early as possible. Thank you.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, while congratulating the Minister of Education on placing the Report so early before the House and the UGC on being so up-to-date in its Report, may I say that it is the same old Report that we have been commenting on for so many years ? Only the figures have changed. Therefore if I make the same old speech that I have been making all these years with only a change in the figures, I hope the House will forgive me.

Of course there is progress in quantity as has been well pointed out by my predecessors, but there is very little progress in quality. The number of students has increased by 13 per cent. The number of colleges and universities has also increased, so much so that a university or a college is required not because of any social purpose that it is going to fulfil but because it is considered to be a status symbol. Every district must have a college, every region must have a university and the greater the number of universities in a State the greater is considered to be the educational achievement of that State. The UGC has done nothing to stem the tide of this quantitative increase in the number of students and colleges and also universities. The number of teachers has increased by 22 per cent. It is quite satisfactory as compared to the increase of students by 13 per cent. But what is the ratio of teachers to students ? It is the same old miserable ratio of one teacher to 15 or 20 students.

How can there be any social or intellectual contact between students and teachers if this ratio has not increased ?

Then I find that there has been an increase in the number of students' hostels and teachers' hostels as also in the number of residential quarters. But still it is not adequate. As for the quality of the students' hostels, the less said the better. In most university and college hostels the rooms that was meant only for one student is packed with three or four students and the usual excuse given is that the demand is so great. But why can't the supply of hostels keep pace with the demand ? How can any student be expected to devote his time to studies if he has got two or three companions with him in the same room who distract his attention from studies by all sorts of gossip ? Unless the ideal of one room for one student is reached, we cannot have real hostel life; it will just be a shelter; that is all. They cannot make use of the social life or the social contact or the intellectual contact that comes from students living together in the same hostel.

A new innovation has taken place in the establishment of Review Committees which go out to examine the syllabuses of universities and colleges, their courses of study and so on. These Review Committees can do their work from their headquarters, from the office of the Commission. They have only to send for those syllabuses; they have only to send for those courses of study and they can examine them. But what does the UGC do in order to go on the spot and study this Or that aspect of college life or student life ? In the very first year when I had an opportunity of commenting on the UGC I recommended that the Members of the UGC should be allotted specific portfolios. One Member may be in charge of hostels. The second Member may be in charge of finances and the third Member may be in charge of studies. These Members should go and visit college after college, university after university, spend days and nights with the students and with the teachers, so that they can study their difficulties and their problems and be able to give advice to them and then they can come back to the Commission and make certain useful recommendations and suggestions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You have given this suggestion previously also.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : That is why he stated in the beginning itself that the Report was the same; only there is a change in figures; and therefore he said that his speech might be the same.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh) : No harm.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : Because they never learn he has to repeat.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : Truth has to be repeated again and again.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Order please.

SHRI M RUTHNASWAMY : Every poor teacher knows that he has to repeat the lessons when the students do not learn *them*. So I have to repeat my speeches and my suggestions from year to year because this blessed Government does not learn.

And then in regard to studies I see very little provision made for the study and research in social sciences. In a country like ours social sciences ought to be one of the most important sciences. We are all taken up with natural sciences, with the glamour of physical, chemical and technological sciences. But social science is absolutely necessary in a country which is divided by religion, divided by caste, divided by social divisions. The problem is how to integrate this country out of all these numerous classes and divisions. We have had various civilisations and cultures in this country from the highest to the lowest. We have people living in palaces of refinement and we have Adivasis living in the most distressing conditions in the forests Harijans in villages, in slummy villages. It is this problem of the social life and how to improve the social life of the country, the social integration of the country, that has to be studied by social scientists. But very little provision is made for it. No doubt we have a number of institutes of sociology. Bombay University has one, and others. There are social scientists who have not paid attention to the problem of village

life, the problem of caste. The problem of caste having converted into class if we are to make any social progress might be studied.

Mention also is made with gratification of the work of employment bureaus of several universities. We are glad that employment bureaus have been appointed, but we have no details as to the success of the work of these employment bureaus, as to how many students they have been able to place in employment. We have appointments boards in English universities but they are active throughout the year, and when they recommend people to several employers and to firms and to Government offices, their recommendations are taken. Are the recommendations of our employment bureaus given any credit by firms, by private employers or by Government employers? We should like to have an analysis of the success of the work of these employment bureaus.

And then, Sir, there is the great question of student discontent, of student unrest. No doubt the University Grants Commission does make a reference to that; we have it on page 29. They say on page 29—

"A number of universities and colleges were affected by student unrest, which is the result of varied factors and circumstances. The Education Commission (1964-66) observed that "the responsibility for the situation is not unilateral—it is not merely that of students or parents or teachers or state governments or political parties but multilateral. All of them share it, together with many factors in the objective situation, and no effective solution is possible unless each agency responsible for the malaise does its own duty. Some of the remedies for student unrest, therefore, go beyond the education system."

And therefore the University Grants Commission gives up this project of finding a solution for student unrest. Are we to wait till political parties improve? Are we to wait till the conduct of Ministers and politicians improves before we can expect an improvement in the behaviour of our students? Then we shall have to wait till Doomsday before any improvement can take place in the conduct of our

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

students. Student discontent, student behaviour or student unrest must be dealt with by teachers, by people who are concerned with education. The University Grants Commission cannot do anything better than appoint a special committee, an expert committee, composed not of old teachers like myself but of those who are in daily contact with students, who are in personal contact with students. It must be composed not only of teachers but also of sociologists, of psychologists all those who have studied generally the social unrest in this country. And they must tackle this problem. We must begin with investigation somewhere. We must begin with this problem of indiscipline somewhere, and we must begin of course in the family which is where the parents and the elders in the family are to look after it. But what about our schools and colleges? They must take up this matter and study this question why our students are not devoted to their studies, why the students do not take part in the general work of their school and their college, why their attention is distracted. Is it because of the physical conditions in our schools and colleges? Certainly the physical conditions in our hostels is one serious contributory factor to the spread of discontent in our country. Our students are not satisfied with the living conditions and so they wander in all kinds of directions. So Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would recommend that the University Grants Commission, which is doing its work within its limitations should take up this matter of improving the quality of our university education. If it is necessary to limit the numbers, they must devise ways and means of limiting the numbers. It cannot start at the matriculation stage, the study of the problem of limiting the numbers; it must start much earlier. It is because the students had no other form of education to turn to, no other form of gainful education to turn to. They have no form of subordinate technical education in junior technical schools, in senior technical schools, at the end of the middle school stage, at the end of the high school stage. It is because they have no vocational guidance. It is because they have no careers master as in every English and American school. It is because they have no guidance either from their parents or their teachers or their head

masters. That is why they go on drifting to class after class after having reached the final secondary school stage, and they have no other opening but to go to the university stage. I remember, when I was Principal of the Law College—asking every student seeking admission, why he was joining the law college and the invariable answer was "because I have nothing else to do". I suppose the same phenomenon occurs because the conditions are the same social and economic conditions, the same unpreparedness both on our part and the public as well, and it continues. Therefore, the University Grants Commission should set its mind seriously to the consideration of this question of improving the quality of students, the quality of university education, the quality of students' education, the quality also of teachers' teaching. Teachers' teaching has also degenerated. It has reduced itself to the dictation of notes. And how can any student be inspired to further his studies when day after day he sits at his desk taking down the notes dictated by his teacher? This is not inspirational lecturing. This is not teaching. Any gramophone, any machine can do that. A lesson could be spoken into a machine and it would be turned out by the machine. You need not have all this expensive paraphernalia of university buildings and university teachers, and Senates and Academic Councils. So I would plead with the Minister of Education and University Grants Commission that they should set about this business of improving the quality of education. Otherwise there is no point in bringing up a University Grants Commission Report year after year and making such speeches as I have to make.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN ; I am glad, Sir, that we are discussing the Report of the University Grants Commission. There is hardly any body in this country charged with a greater task than this Commission. We have a very estimable Chairman of the Commission and the Commission itself is doing good work in many directions,

I want at this stage to refer to the Report of the Education Commission, not that of the University Grants Commission. It was a great Education Commission. The credit for appointing that Commission goes to the ex-Minister of Education who is happily sitting here with us today Mr. Chagla.

He had great hopes from this Commission. He had great hopes that when the Report of the Commission came his hands would be able to implement many of the recommendations. The tragedy of the situation was that by the time the recommendations came a stage of implementation came, Mr. Chagla had gone to another portfolio altogether. I was one of those who deeply regretted it. Of course there is no use of regretting the change of portfolios made by the Prime Minister.

PROF. V.K.R.V. RAO : It has to be accepted.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : You have to go to reckon with it and one has to accept it as Dr. Rao says.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : Willy-nilly.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : When the Education Commission's Report was discussed on the floor of this House at that time Dr. Sen was sitting in the Minister's chair. I remember a somewhat critical approach to the recommendations of the Commission particularly in reference to basic education and the fundamental principles of basic education, after a reference to all that, I ended up by looking at Dr. Sen and saying, 'if you can implement at least 10 per cent of the recommendations of this Commission your name will go down in the history of education in India.' But before any percentage could be reached in the implementation he also disappeared and now we have another redoubtable Education Minister in Dr. Rao sitting here.

SHRI Z. A. AHMAD : You are sure he will sit?

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : I have never known a Ministry in which a succession of Ministers, extraordinarily able men—who can be able than Mr. Chagla or Dr. Rao—pining to do things.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : But Mr. Chagla was removed because of his ability.

THE VICECHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Let him continue.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : Let me...

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I am saying that Mr. Chagla's disqualification was his ability. That is a fact.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : I like to hear the voice of Shrimati Yashoda Reddy but not when I am speaking because then I just get lost.

These extremely capable and brilliant education Ministers were pining to do work, thirsting to bring about reforms but all the time when you went and talked to them there was frustration in their minds, there was frustration in their hearts because the wherewithal to do the work for which they were thirsting was not in their hands. The finances of the Education Ministry are perhaps the finances of a very sad Ministry. I remember Mr. Chagla sitting there and saying : I want to fight for more funds and more funds. He fought for them but I do not think he got them; he got too little. Now education is not getting in this country under any Government which has come and gone the necessary attention, the necessary importance to which it is entitled. After all, you may do anything else in the country but if millions of boys and girls are educated in a manner in which they do not really finally come up to be worthy citizens of the kind of Republic we have in mind, then everything is going wrong basically. Even today, Sir, I do not wish to fit into the rut of this Report and then begin looking at it because then I may be caught by the details in the Report itself. I do not wish to deal with a little detail here and with a little detail there. Whoever wishes to do that is welcome to do so. I want to say something which is not in the Report; I wish to say something which is germane to the Report nevertheless.

This concept of the universities as a kind of super-structure on the entire system of education sitting and functioning at the top level without any integration with the rest of the system at the secondary education level and at the elementary education level is, I think, perpetuating a schism in education which is fatal to education. You cannot have good secondary education unless you have good elementary education and you are never going to

[Shri G. Ramachandran.]

have good college and university education unless you have good secondary education. Now, it is not possible quickly and suddenly to tell the House or even to say to myself how the whole of education can be integrated in such a manner that the universities functioning at the highest level are able to throw roots down deep into the soil of education and pull out such nurture as college and university education requires. Some way has to be devised by which universities can function with some kind of a mission at the secondary education level and at the elementary education level.

Somebody was speaking about Shanti Niketan and Viswa Bharati. Under the Act by which the Viswa Bharati has been created the school is in the university. The primary school is there; the secondary school is there. The entire apparatus created by Rabindranath Tagore is inside it and it is possible in a structure of that kind for a university to derive from the depths of elementary and secondary education the substance that is necessary to make university education real. I am not suggesting that we must add to the existing confusion. There is plenty of confusion even at the college level. I am not suggesting that by entrusting responsibility which at that level they cannot perhaps shoulder, we must increase the confusion. But this schism, if I might say so, between the lower levels of education and the higher level which is being perpetuated all the time is fatal both to the lower levels of education and to the higher level of education. It would be for educationists to sit together and plan out some way of integration which would add to the substance of education at all levels.

Then, Sir, take the universities. I would not call them ivory towers; that would be too cheap a criticism. I would not even say that the universities are totally cut off from the rest of the country but I would say this with probably no fear of contradiction that a university does not play, in the area in which the university is situated, the role of lifting up the whole of that area in terms of educational realities. What happens outside the campus of the university is of absolutely no consequence to the university. I have seen some of the best universities; I

do not want to name them. Step out of the gate and the old filthy superstition-ridden drab life of the people continues around the walls of the university.

Now, what the University doing ? They have completed twenty years or thirty years and some of them have completed even their centenary year, but they have hardly touched the life of a man or woman in the immediate environment. This again is something that I wish to stress. If I went on discussing this Report along the lines in which it is written, I cannot deal with these things. The Education Commission had many relevant things to say about all these matters. In fact, when I spoke about that Commission's Report, at that time I said that it would be a long time before anybody could say anything more than what the Commission had said about everything concerning education. It is not the book, it is not the report, it is not the sentences that matter. Somebody has to implement what the Commission has called for. I am not saying that our universities are ivory towers, because boys and girls who are educated, when they have the intellectual ferment, when they can think for themselves and come out into the whole world, make some contribution to the total life of the people as a whole, but that is something **too** far-fetched and too long range. Is it possible, I am asking the Education Minister, is it possible, I am asking my friends in this House that we make a university responsible for the total uplift and development of an area in the midst of which that university is situated ? This is done through what I call extension work. We have talked about extension *ad nauseam*. In fact, we have extended extension to such an extent that there is no real extension anywhere at all. We are told that the school must have extension work and every college must have extension work and the universities must have extension work, but what is going on is nothing except a kind of figurative thing called extension. What I have in mind is the reality of extension and this reality can be tested. If a university is, under a statute, made responsible for an area—not that it wholly confines itself to the area but it gives attention to that area and to many things in it, *e.g.*, health sanitation, the social life of the people, the superstition which has become the bane of

the existence of the Indian people then something significant may happen. We have advanced in many directions, but many of our superstitions remain entrenched in our minds...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES (SHRI BHAKT DARSHAN) : Rahu Kal.

SHRI G. R. VMACHANDRAN : I know of an Oxford M. A. who came back from Oxford and would not come out of the house unless the "Sakunam" was right. What are we to do with this system of education which tinkers with the upper stratum, but will not involve the whole of a human being in a new way of life? (*Interruptions.*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Shrimati Yashoda Reddy, you must please keep order.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : This is very unfair. She was saying something and I told her, "Let us not interrupt till she finishes". It was Kumari Shanta 'asist and I told her, "Let us not interfere at all." I take objection to your words and it is unfair to me.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : I give you, Madam, a vote of thanks. Now, I have spoken about the need for extension and the need for an integrated study of the life of the people round about the university.

Then, there is such a thing as research. You know how many sins can be covered under this word 'research'. Anything is research and if something is research you get all the money you want. What happens to the money afterwards is probably nobody's business. But I do attach great importance to research. Apart from pure research—pure research is something beyond my capacity—it is well within the capacity of Dr. Rao, we need problem-oriented research in the area in which the university is situated and functioning, to study the problems of that area and send back proper solutions to the people for those problems. Now, Sir, I do not know whether you have heard of a few institutions in this country called Rural Institutes of Higher Education. I am in charge of one. Academic leaning, extension and

research are the inescapable concomitants of a research institute. I know therefore it is possible to do real and dynamic extension work. Problem-oriented research and extension work, instead of weakening academic studies, will strengthen and enrich academic studies. So, the whole concept of a university has to undergo a radical transformation. Many things have changed in India after the British left, but so far as the universities are concerned, they are going on along the old rut.

Another point on which I would take a minute or two is that in this country, through lucky accidents of history—if I may use an expression of that kind—we have a magnificent composite culture. I said yesterday that if anybody says Indian culture is only or wholly Hindu culture, he should be sent to a lunatic asylum. Indian culture is a composite culture, which has received into itself the finest things of Islamic culture, the finest things of Western culture and the finest things of almost every culture you can recall in the history of the world. I want to know whether in any university today there is even an echo of this subject, the composite culture of India, which is the greatest heritage of history to our people. Now, unless we bring to our young men and women the joys and the glory of this composite culture, we get sunk in one separatist culture in which different groups and political parties are interested. These foment, among the students, narrowness of mind even when they are engaged in the process of liberal education. If our universities are not taking up this challenge of the composite culture of India, so that every boy and girl in this country grows up to realise that he or she has inherited something which is of priceless value, then the mind of our students is not becoming a part of the national integration programme.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : You want indoctrination of no kind.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : I object to any kind of indoctrination. Composite culture is the enemy of indoctrination because it will throw into a common basket many ideas, thoughts and values. There is one other matter I would stress. Please do not graft on to education anything. You have the central stream of education. You bring

[Shri G. Ramachandran.]

something from somewhere and put a little gum and paste it on Education. You take something else and paste it with a little gum on education. This will not serve in the slightest manner the purpose we have in mind. Education is like the blood-stream in the body. If you want to make that body healthy, it is not done by simply putting into the mouth a couple of new teeth or wearing spectacles. They may all be adventitious aids, but if you want a healthy human system, the remedies and nutrition should go into the bloodstream of life. So, education should not be made a kind of Christmas tree on which you hang all kinds of things. National integration is such a matter. Scientific outlook is another. If you do not put these into the main stream of education, you get nothing worth the name of integration or scientific outlook. I notice every time there is a problem somebody brings an appendage, calls it a scheme or project, takes a little gum and pastes it on the body of education. This must stop. We must put all we really want into the blood stream of education from the primary to the university. Then alone it becomes natural and it becomes part of the blood and bone of the growing generations. This is not being done. You will notice that I have said almost nothing about what is in this Report, because once I am in the rut of the Report, there are things which one has to say, which take you along with the current, but these are some of the things which I thought I should say. I am glad Mr. Chagla is sitting here and I am particularly happy that Dr. Rao is here to listen to what I am saying.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR AU KHAN) : I am sure the Education Minister will take note of the weighty suggestions made by Mr. Ramachandran.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, सदन के सामने अभी जो प्रतिवेदन प्रस्तुत हुआ है, उसे बहुत से मित्रों ने अभी सराहना के रूप में देखा। बहुत से मित्रों ने उस पर आलोचनाएं भी कीं और यदि केवल इसी बात को देखा जाये कि हमने कुछ यूनीवर्सिटियों को बढ़ा कर 70 यूनीवर्सिटियां कर दीं या कालेजों की संख्या बढ़ाई—हमने अब

2,899 कालेज कर दिये—इसी से अगर संतोष का मापदंड माना जाये, तो हम समझते हैं कि हम गलती करेंगे। एजुकेशन मंत्रालय दुर्भाग्य से एक ऐसा मंत्रालय रहा है कि जिसमें शिक्षा जगत की अपेक्षाएं कम और राजनैतिक अपेक्षाएं अधिक से अधिक रही हैं और यही कारण है कि स्वतंत्रता के पश्चात् से आज तक इस दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण मंत्रालय में अनेक परिवर्तन हुए हैं, किसी एक बुद्धिमान व्यक्ति को लगातार बँटाकर कार्य करने का कोई अवसर नहीं दिया गया और यही कारण है कि हम बहुत सी समस्याओं में आगे नहीं बढ़े और समस्याओं में उलझे हुए हैं। उदाहरण के लिये, हमारा दुर्भाग्य यह भी रहा कि योजना मंत्रालय, शिक्षा मंत्रालय में टांग अड़ाने के लिये आ पहुँचा और इस बात का पता न चला कर कि वास्तव में हमारे लिये इस देश में कितनी आवश्यकताएँ हैं, उन आवश्यकताओं को नज़र-अंदाज करते हुए, जो कार्य शिक्षा मंत्रालय को करना चाहिये था, उस कार्य को उसने अपने हाथ में लिया। उदाहरण के लिये इन्जीनियरिंग को ले लीजिए। हमारे देश में एक समय बड़े जोर शोर से कहा गया कि अपने देश में इन्जीनियरों की बहुत आवश्यकता है और उस विषय में हमारे शिक्षा पाने वाले विद्यार्थियों को अधिक रुचि लेनी चाहिये। बस, चारों तरफ से उसकी बाढ़ आ गई और उस बाढ़ का परिणाम यह हुआ कि आज इन्जीनियरिंग कालेज से निकलने वाले छात्र जगह जगह पर ठोकर खाते हुए फिर रहे हैं। हम वह समस्या हल नहीं कर पाये। हालत इतनी बिगड़ी हुई है कि केवल इन्जीनियरिंग से निकले हुए नहीं, बल्कि कितने ही पोली-टेकनीक के छात्रगण भी आज केवल पचास-पचास रुपये महीने पर, जो कि जीवन स्तर का बहुत छोटा अंश होता है, भी नौकरी की भीख मांगते फिर रहे हैं। प्रश्न यह है श्रीमन्, कि हमारी शिक्षा का ढांचा, हमारी शिक्षा के रहन सहन का रूप, किस प्रकार का होना चाहिये? भारतवर्ष की आवश्यकताओं का निर्वाह करने में हम कहाँ तक सफल हुए हैं।

हम समझते हैं कि शिक्षा मंत्रालय केवल एक ऐसा मंत्रालय था, जो देश की प्राथमिक आवश्यकताओं को ऊंचा उठा सकता था, देश में राष्ट्रीयता का बीज बो सकता था और देश को अन्य देशों के मुकाबले में आगे बढ़ाने में सक्षम हो सकता था, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से इन तीन बातों में हम पीछे रहे। हमारे यहां रिसर्च की बात भी कही गई। इस सदन का कोई माननीय सदस्य क्या यह कह सकता है कि संसार में जितने रिसर्च और स्थानों पर हो रहे हैं, उस प्रकार से हमारे शिक्षा मंत्रालय में भी क्या रिसर्च के लिये कोई कार्य किया गया है? नहीं किया गया है। उदाहरण के लिये बहुत सी बातें कही जा सकती हैं, लेकिन एक दो बातों पर श्रीमान् का ध्यान आकर्षित करूंगा। इन्डोनेशिया और सीलोन मूल रूप में आयुर्वेद के ऊपर अधिक विश्वास करते हैं, बनिस्वत हमारे इस देश के जो कि आयुर्वेद का जन्मदाता रहा है और दुर्भाग्य से बर्लिन में पहुंच कर हमारे यहां के रिसर्च करने वाले व्यक्ति अनुसंधान कर सकते हैं कि हृदय रोग की कौन सी औषधि है। लेकिन भारतवर्ष में रह कर इस रिसर्च का कोई लाभ नहीं उठाया गया। दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि यद्यपि हमारे यहां एक से एक अच्छे हीरों को परखने वाले व्यक्ति हुए हैं, तथापि वह बाहर के देशों में जाते हैं और बाहर के देशों में नोबल प्राइज लेकर लौटते हैं, तो क्या हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों के हृदय में कसमसहाट पैदा नहीं होती। हमारे देश के लड़के जो हमारे देश के भाग्य को आगे बढ़ाने में सक्षम हो सकते थे, आज हमारे देश में उनके कोई प्रश्रय नहीं मिले, वह बाहर के दूसरे देशों में जाते हैं और भारत के हो कर भी दूसरे देशों का नाम उजागर कर रहे हैं। रिसर्च में कितना रुपया दिया गया? रिसर्च के लिये दिया गया है केवल 5 लाख रु०। 5 लाख रु० में कभी रिसर्च ही नहीं सकती। जब तक रिसर्च करने वाले को आयुपर्यन्त सुख साधन और मस्तिष्क की बेचैनी हटाने के लिये सुविधाएं नहीं दी जायगी, तब तक

वह मनोयोग से उस दिशा में अनुसंधान कर नहीं सकता और जैसा कि सबको विदित है, संसार में जो सबसे बड़े रिसर्च करने वाले हुए हैं, उनका जीवन बड़े कष्ट, कठिनाई और संग्राम में बीता। लेकिन मानव जाति के लिए वह बड़े से बड़ा लाभ पहुंचाने वाले सिद्ध हुए हैं। तो यहां पर जो कठिनाई से जीवन व्यतीत कर रहे हैं, उनके लिये हमने क्या किया? मंत्रालय ने इसकी तरफ कोई भी विशेष रूप से ध्यान नहीं दिया।

इसी तरह से स्टूडेन्ट्स एंड फ्रेंड के बारे में है। अगर किसी विद्यार्थी के लिये आप 100 रु० या 200 रु० दे दें और उससे यह आकांक्षा करें कि हमने विद्यार्थी जगत के उपकार के लिये डाल दिया है, तो वह कल्पना एक बहुत बड़ी गलत कल्पना होगी। प्रश्न यह है कि पूरे भारतवर्ष में और समस्त विश्वविद्यालयों में, जहां पर कि कोई अच्छे प्रतिभाशाली छात्र हमें मिले, उन प्रतिभाशाली छात्रों के लिये हमने क्या किया। युनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन ने उसके बारे में भी आखें मूंद लीं, केवल एक दो स्थानों में कुछ आदमियों को, कुछ प्रतिभाओं को देकर के बाकी और व्यक्तियों को नदी के प्रवाह में बहते रहने के लिये छोड़ दिया गया। इस प्रकार से कभी निश्चित रूप से उन्नती हो नहीं सकती। इसी प्रकार से एड्वान्स स्टडीज की बात आती है, अगर एड्वान्स स्टडीज का नाम यही हो कि हम बैल गाड़ी युग से निकल कर रेल गाड़ी युग में आकर बैठ जायें, तो हम समझते हैं कि सरकार के जो प्रगति के चरण बढ़ते जा रहे हैं, उनके साथ हम नहीं बढ़ पायेंगे। मैं इस संबंध में अपने मंत्रालय का ध्यान तीन बातों की तरफ आकर्षित करता हूं। संसार में तीन राष्ट्र ऐसे थे, जो 1945 के बाद पद दलित, त्रस्त और लुटे राष्ट्र थे, एक जापान, एक जर्मनी, एक इजराइल। क्या कोई स्वाभिमानी भारतीय कह सकता है कि इन तीनों राष्ट्रों की तुलना में, जो कि किसी समय पद-दलित थे, उनके इतिहास में अधिक समय भी



## [श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

नहीं हुआ, केवल बीस, पच्चीस वर्ष पहले की बात है, क्या हम उनकी अपेक्षा अधिक प्रगतिशील हैं? असली बात यह कि इसके लिये किसी ने ध्यान नहीं दिया। शिक्षा मंत्रालय का कर्तव्य केवल यह नहीं है कि सरकार से रुपया मांग लेना और रुपया मांग लेने के बाद सरकार जो कुछ भी रुपया दे दे उसके ऊपर यह आलोचना करना कि हम लोगों ने जितना रुपया मांगा था उतना नहीं दिया गया, इसीलिये हमारे कर्तव्य की इतिश्री हो गई, मैं समझता हूँ यह अच्छी बात नहीं है। जो कुछ भी हमारे पास है, उसमें हमने कितना कर्तव्य पालन करके कोई नयी परम्परा को जन्म दिया या नहीं दिया? उदाहरण के लिये दक्षिण में, केरल में एक मामूली व्यक्ति रहता है। उसने यहाँ पर भारत सरकार को चिट्ठी दी, उसने हथको भी लिख कर भजा कि कोई रेलवे का इंजन अगर तेज स्पीड में चला जा रहा है, तो उसको रोकने के लिये ब्रेक के अतिरिक्त और भी वस्तुएं हैं, जो उसने अनुसंधान करके बनाई हैं। हमारी सरकार ने उसकी तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। उसका केवल एक अपराध और कसूर यह था कि बहुत गरीब परिवार में वह व्यक्ति पैदा हुआ था। उसका सबने मजाक उड़ाया, वह यहाँ पर एक महीने तक रहा और फिर वापस चला गया। हमने एक मंत्रालय का ध्यान आकर्षित कराया लेकिन उस मंत्रालय ने भी उस पर कोई विशेष ध्यान नहीं दिया। तो क्या प्रगति केवल शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में ही हो सकती है, शिक्षा शास्त्रीयों को इस ओर भी ध्यान देना चाहिए कि इस प्रकार के मस्तिष्क जो कहीं-कहीं पर घूरे में पड़े रहते हैं, उनको उठा कर जनता के सामने लाया जाना चाहिये और उस हेतु यत्न किया जाना चाहिये।

इसी प्रकार से श्रीमन्, अपने यहाँ एकजामि-नेशन लेने का जो एक तरीका है, वही बेल गाड़ी युग का चला आ रहा है। हमने भी श्रीमन्, परीक्षाएं दीं। लेकिन यह समझने में

हम आज तक कासिर रहे हैं कि यह क्या कारण है कि एक आदमी एक साथ ही एक परीक्षा बी० ए० की देता है। और उसी वर्ष में वह एक विषय में दूसरे डिवीजन में पास हो जाता है और दो विषयों में फेल जाता है। दूसरे साल जब उसे फिर परीक्षा देनी होती है, तो जिस विषय में वह दूसरे डिवीजन में पास हो जाता है, उसी विषय में परीक्षा देने के लिये बाध्य किया जाता है। इस तरह की कई बातें हैं, जिन्हें शिक्षा मंत्रालय को और शिक्षा शास्त्रीयों को ध्यान देना चाहिये। जब कोई विद्यार्थी एक विषय में पास हो जाता है, तो उसके लिए यह आवश्यक नहीं होना चाहिये कि उसी विषय में वह दुबारा परीक्षा दे। आज इस बात की कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि पश्चिमी देशों में परीक्षा के संबंध में क्या क्या उपाय किये गये हैं और उन उपायों का अध्ययन करने के बाद यहाँ परीक्षा के संबंध में किस प्रकार उन्नति हो सकती है, इस तरह का कार्य किया जाना चाहिये।

इसी तरह से हिस्ट्री के प्रोग्राम के बारे में बतलाया गया है। मुझे इस बात का दुःख है कि इस प्रतिवेदन में हिस्ट्री के संबंध में उल्लेख किया गया है और यह उल्लेख पश्चिमी जगत की हिस्ट्री किस प्रकार से पढ़ाई जाय, उसके विषय में है। लेकिन हमारे देश की हिस्ट्री किस प्रकार से पढ़ाई जाय, उसके विषय में कभी कुछ सोचने का विचार किया है? आज हमारे देश की स्थिति यह है कि हमारे यहाँ सबसे बड़े राजा भारतीय संस्कृति के विक्रमादित्य हुए हैं। विक्रमादित्य के बारे में भारत सरकार के किसी मंत्रालय को आज तक यह पता नहीं है कि वे किस सम्बत में पैदा हुए थे और उनकी कौन कौनसी विशेषताएँ थीं? इस बात के ऊपर सब लोग मौन हैं। विक्रम विश्वविद्यालय को इस संबंध में अनुसंधान करने के लिए एक धेला भी नहीं दिया गया ताकि वह इस विषय में खोज कर सके कि जो भारतवर्ष का सबसे बड़ा राजा था, जिसने यहाँ पर सम्बत चलाया, जिसका सम्बत आज तक नेपाल में चल रहा है, उसके विषय में शिक्षा

मंत्रालय न सोच पाया है और न ही उसके विषय में अनुसंधान ही कर पाया है। अब यह कहा जाता है कि यहां पर पश्चिमी देशों का इतिहास पढ़ाया जाय और इस संबंध में 17 वीं शताब्दी के विषय में खोज होनी चाहिये। इस तरह की जो विवेचना करते हैं, वह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है और न ही कोई अच्छी परम्परा है।

इसी तरह से स्कालरशिप देने के बारे में मैं कुछ निवेदन कर देना चाहता हूं। स्कालरशिप देने के बारे में जिस नीति को व्यवहार में लाया जाता है, उसके बारे में मुझे दुःख है। मुझे ऐसे केसेज मालूम हैं लेकिन मैं यहां पर छोटकशी नहीं करना चाहता हूं, क्योंकि यह बड़ा गम्भीर विषय है। मैं समझता हूं कि हमारे माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री जी इस तरफ निश्चय ध्यान देंगे और इस प्रकार के कार्यों में सिफारिश को नहीं आने देंगे। अगर हम इस चीज में सिफारिश को बढ़ावा देंगे, सिफारिश पहुंचाते रहेंगे, तो निश्चित रूप से हम अपने कर्तव्य पालन में पिछड़ जायेंगे। हमारे लिए इस संबंध में यह कसौटी होनी चाहिये कि जो अच्छे विद्यार्थी हों, उन विद्यार्थियों को योग्य विद्या पाने के लिए अवसर दिया जाना चाहिये। इस तरह के विद्यार्थियों को ही हमें स्कालरशिप देना चाहिये ताकि वे अपनी शिक्षा को आगे बढ़ा सकें और यह स्कालरशिप उनके लिए सहायक हो सके। इन बातों की तरफ शिक्षा मंत्रालय को ध्यान देना चाहिये।

इसी तरफ से, दो-तीन और कठिनाइयों की तरफ मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूं। अभी हमारे योग्य मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि हमारे देश में छात्रों में असंतोष बढ़ता ही चला जा रहा है। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इस असंतोष को मिटाने के लिए अब तक क्या कुछ किया गया है। मैं यहां पर इस संबंध में यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि 1960-61 में छात्रों में जितना असंतोष था, 1965 में वह चौगुना हो गया है और 1965 में जितना असंतोष था, 1969

में उससे चौगुना हो गया है। इसका कारण यह है कि प्रत्येक छात्र जो बी० ई०, एम० बी० बी० एस० और बी० ए० की डिग्री हांसिल करता है, तो उसके बाद वह नौकरी करना चाहता है। जब वह नौकरी के लिए चारों तरफ दरवाजा खटखटाता है, तो उसे नौकरी नहीं मिलती है। इसके बाद वह दूसरी जगहों में जाता है, जहां पर वह कोई न कोई काम करने के लिए बाध्य हो जाता है। इस तरह से आज विद्यार्थियों में बेरोजगारी बढ़ती ही चली जा रही है और उनके लिए शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने अभी तक कुछ भी नहीं किया है। इस बेरोजगारी की समस्या को दूर करने के लिए शिक्षा मंत्रालय के और यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने जो कुछ भी लिखा है, इस तरह की टिप्पणी बराबर लिखी जानी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूं कि उन्होंने जो कुछ लिखा है वह अपने स्थान पर विशेष स्थान नहीं रखता है, क्योंकि जिस गम्भीरता से इस विषय पर ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये था, उतना उस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है। मैं आशा करता हूं कि भविष्य में शिक्षा मंत्रालय इस विषय में गम्भीरता के साथ विचार करेगा।

श्रीमन्, एक और बात की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूं और मंत्री जी से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हमारा भारत-वर्ष और देशों के मुकाबले में क्या विशेषता रखता है। अगर आप यह कहते हैं कि हमारा देश विज्ञान में विशेषता रखता है, तो वह विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में भी बाकी संसार से पीछे है। अगर खेल कूद के बारे में कहा जाय, तो वह खेल कूद के संबंध में भी बाकी संसार से पीछे है। अगर आप दूसरी बातों की तरफ कहें तो इस संसार में और भी ऐसे कई देश हैं जो हमसे ज्यादा प्रगतिशील हैं। लेकिन एक बात में हमारा भारतवर्ष अनन्तकाल से सब देशों से आगे रहा है और वह विषय है आध्यात्मवाद। तो इस आध्यात्मवाद के विषय में हमारे शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने कौनसा विशेष ध्यान दिया है, यह बात मेरी समझ में अभी तक नहीं आई है। मैं समझता हूं कि भारतवर्ष के छात्रों के जीवन को चरित्रवान बनाने के लिए,

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

उनमें अनुशासन कायम करने के लिए तथा उन्हें स्वावलम्बी बनाने के लिए शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने कोई उपाय नहीं किये हैं। जब तक उन्हें स्वाध्याय और आध्यात्मिकता की ओर आकर्षित नहीं करेंगे तब तक वे उन्नति नहीं कर सकते हैं। आज दूसरे देश के लोग हमारी तरफ आ रहे हैं। उदाहरण के लिए श्रीमन्, मैं एक-दो बात आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। श्रीमन्, आपने महेश योगी का नाम सुना होगा। उनके बारे में दो प्रकार की रायें हैं। कुछ लोग तो उन्हें अच्छा कहते हैं और कुछ लोग उन्हें बुरा कहते हैं। लेकिन बाहर की जनता और सरकार के दूसरे देश आज भारतवर्ष की तरफ और महेश योगी की तरफ धूमते हैं। दूसरे व्यक्ति के नाम का मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ जो कि अमेरीका में रहते हैं और जो जगन्नाथपुरी की तस्वीरों को वहाँ की जनता के सामने रखते हैं और इस तरह से यहाँ के देश के बारे में गलत बातें बतलाते हैं। आज पश्चिमी देशों में आध्यात्मवाद के बारे में बड़ी भूख लगी हुई है। लेकिन हमारा देश उनको इस प्रकार की शिक्षा देने के बारे में आज असमर्थ है; क्योंकि आज तक इस विषय के बारे में हमारे देश में बहुत कम अनुसन्धान किया गया है।

श्रीमन्, एक और बात मैं निवेदन कर देना चाहता हूँ। मुझे बहुत दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारे देश में कम्पोजिट कल्चर की बात कही जाती है। हमारे एक पुराने शिक्षा शास्त्री कहा करते थे कि कम्पोजिट कल्चर, मिलीजुली संस्कृति नाम की कोई संस्कृति नहीं है। संस्कृति और सभ्यता, दोनों में अंतर होता है। सभ्यता और संस्कृति में क्या अंतर है? सभ्यता व्यक्तिगत होती है और संस्कृति समाजवादी होती है। बहुत दिनों तक जो रहन-सहन किसी जाति विशेष में तरक्की करता है उसी की मान्यता हो जाती है और अच्छे काम फैलाकर परम्परागत कर दिये जाते हैं तो उसको संस्कृति कहते हैं। ब्रिटेन की संस्कृति यह है कि वहाँ के राजसिंहासन पर जो बैठता है, टैम्स नदी का पानी उसके ऊपर सिंचन किया जाता है।

GIPN—S7—45 R.S.(ND)/69—18-6-70—570.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : They do not attach much importance to that.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : श्रीमन्, आप मुझे से दृष्टिकोण में विभिन्न रख रखते हैं और यह बात आपकी समझ में नहीं आ सकती है, जब तक आप यह पहलू और उस पहलू पर ध्यान नहीं देंगे। यही कारण है कि जब तक कम्पोजिट कल्चर में जा कर रहेंगे तब तक इस देश में कभी भी एकता नहीं आ सकती है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कौन-कौन से कम्पोजिट कल्चर वाले पचासों देश हैं, तो केवल इस देश में एकता के गाने क्यों गाये जा रहे हैं। क्या यहाँ पर किसी ने कम बलिदान किया है। यहाँ बड़े-बड़े विद्वान हुए और इस संबंध में बड़ी बड़ी विचार धारा और गोष्ठी चली। लेकिन दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज तक हम लोगों में एकता पैदा नहीं हो सकी। इसका कारण क्या है? इसका कारण यह है कि वृक्ष की डालों में पानी देने से वृक्ष जीवित नहीं रह सकता है। इसी तरह से कम्पोजिट कल्चर अपने स्थान पर सही नहीं है। कम्पोजिट कल्चर से देश नहीं बन सकता है। देश जो बनता है, वह अपने प्राचीन संस्कृति के आधार पर बनकर खड़ा होता है। जब तक इस प्रकार की संस्कृति नहीं होती है तब तक निश्चित रूप से देश आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपका भाषण समाप्त कर रहा हूँ, क्योंकि श्रीमन्, आपने दो बार घंटी बजा दी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस विषय में हमारे योग्य मंत्री जी अधिक ध्यान देंगे। जो जो कठिनाइयाँ शिक्षा शास्त्रियों के सामने हैं, यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन के सामने हैं, छात्र जगत के सामने हैं, उन पर आप ध्यान करेंगे, मनन करेंगे और इन विषयों के बारे में पूरा ध्यान देंगे, ऐसी मेरी आशा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I am sorry, Mr. Chagla. You will have time tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 26th November, 1969.