

that previously we had an idea and ■we had been fighting for the ideal of securing the independence of the country. Nothing else mattered in that idealism. We forgot our caste; •we forgot money. People who spent lakhs of rupees against us got themselves defeated. Today we think money is necessary for fighting elections. Why is it that these things are more influential today? That is because today we have lost that idealism. That loss of idealism is reflected in the student community. Today that student community do not have that idealism very much. I appreciated it when Mr. Vajpayee said that students were engaged in these local borders forgetting our national borders. It is true. If they are patriotic, they must transcend the small group feelings which they have and in doing so it is a national effort that we have to make. Our students are the source, the foundation of the future of this country. One generation intimately connected with our national struggle, -with Gandhiji, is passing out and in a few years there will be only a few left. Even among the people who once experienced it, we do not find that idealism today, of what they felt then. We have that feeling, that experience, but hereafter even people with that experience will be few. And so it rests upon us, upon the political parties of the country, upon leadership of every kind, that we again inspire idealism in this field. How will we do it? It is beyond me. This cannot be done by giving a few points. It is a matter of spirit and light. Light lights. A wick that does not burn cannot light other lamps. We must be able to throw up leaders who can transcend these small things. And in that context I would say that it depends on our political parties, to whichever group they belong. Perhaps it is too much to expect that. It depends on the devotion we have for our country, whether we love our party more or whether we love our country less; whether we love our country more and ourselves less.

That is the question which every political party has to answer here. One word more, Sir. While 12 Noon I entirely agree that this is a matter over which we must think, contemplate and decide, I do not know why a national conference should be convened. I think we have bodies like the Standing Committee on Education, the Consultative Committee on Education, the Planning Committee for our own Party, and so on, and then we have the National Integration Council. I would suggest that this very important question should be discussed by us and the problems understood with a view to finding a solution.

1

#### REFERENCE TO PROPOSED STATEMENT ABOUT SUGARCANE. PRICE FOR 1962-63

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI RAM SUBHAG SINGH) : Yesterday I had sought your permission to make a statement regarding the fixation of sugarcane price for the year 1962-63. But we decided this morning not to make this statement, and I requested you also and you had kindly allowed me not to make it. So I am not making the statement

#### RESOLUTION *RE* KEEPING STUDENTS OUT OF ACTIVE POLITICS

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, there are few propositions which I would support more willingly and more strongly than the proposition which has been moved today by Mr. Vajpayee. I had my doubts about the Communist Party and especially Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I wonder why he has bothered to send even two amendments when his whole speech showed that he was entirely against the whole idea of keeping our students away from politics.

[Prof. A. R. Wadia.]

Sir, I have spent a lifetime with students, and I am prepared to say that our students, in spite of all that has been said against them today in the country at large, have been more sinned against than sinning. They are a very fine lot, but they require to be dealt with sympathetically, tactfully and as kindly as possible. Unfortunately the present-day students do not get the right type of lead, and that is the reason, why political leaders find in them very good material for their own purposes.

Sir, our students were drawn into politics by our political leaders. At that time there was a good deal of difference of opinion in the country at large. I remember such a prominent leader as Mrs. Annie Beasant raising a warning against that tendency of drawing students into politics. But our other leaders did not listen to that. Perhaps there was some justification for it. When a country is fighting for its political freedom, that fight has to be carried on on all fronts including even the students, and perhaps there was some justification for inveigling students into politics. But now that we have attained independence, now that we have attained a stable form of democratic Government, it is certainly a question whether the students require to be inveigled into politics any more, and I feel very strongly that the students should be left to do their work as students. That point has been argued very well by Mr. Vajpayee. It does not mean that they are not to be interested in politics. They have to be interested in politics. They have to know something of the meaning of democracy, Communism, and all that, and the more they read about it, the more they think about it, the better for the country. But there is a distinction. What we mean by active politics, participating in active politics, I believe, was the type of politics that Mr. Vajpayee has in mind. What Mr. Sapru was talking about was more of a theoretical type.

That is entirely different. Every modern student, especially every modern university student, must know the implications of the present-day political theories and political developments. But active politics is an entirely different kind.

Sir, I had a very disheartening experience. When I was Principal of a college at the time that our country gained freedom, it was a college which was not easy to deal with. I think there was a strike in those days almost every fortnight, and it took me nearly six months before I gained the confidence of my students and before they would begin to listen to me and have faith in me. After the attainment of independence I advised my students to give up politics. I told them: "Well, you have played your part, and you have the consolation and you can take pride in it that your struggle has succeeded. But now there is no more need for you to be active politicians. It is now your duty to go back to your studies in a calm frame of mind and do your work." I am very happy to say that they agreed with me. But unfortunately they were connected with the political Congress Party, and the student leaders found it necessary to consult the Education Minister of that State, and the Education Minister would not agree to dissolving the students' contact. The reason is very clear, because all political leaders find students very agreeable material to work for them as canvassers or to inveigle them into all sorts of political activity. I personally felt that it was very unsound advice, but we had to yield.

Now, Sir, even assuming that the Congress Party today is not in the same frame of mind—and as the most prominent leaders of the Congress Party have been speaking out against the students, especially their indiscipline—the students feel aggrieved. They say: "There was a time when they wanted our assistance. They made full use of us, they exploited

us, and now they have turned into preachers and want us to give up active politics. They have thrown us overboard. Instead of being supported we are criticised". That is the feeling of many students. Even assuming that the Congress Party today is in a frame of mind to take a different view of the active participation of students in politics, there remains the question of the other Parties. I have my doubts whether the Communist Party would ever be a party to this sort of conference that Mr. Vajpayee suggests, and my doubt has been completely confirmed by the speech of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. They do not want students to be kept out, they are too useful for their own purposes. Unfortunately the students do not know the implications of this. They do not know that once the Communists get power, no student will have the courage or will be permitted to speak out against them. They will soon be taught their place, as every section of the public is taught its place, in a Communist regime. There is no question of free political discussion or free democratic discussion about which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta makes himself so eloquent and so prominent when he is in opposition. But if he ever were a member of a Communist Government, he would speak in a different tone altogether. Neither the students nor the grown-ups would have the slightest opportunity of speaking against the government at that time.

Well, Sir, it is from that standpoint that I say this. I do not know whether, even if the Government accepts this Resolution—and I hope that they will make an honest effort to work out the implications of this Resolution—it will completely succeed because of the attitude of the Communist Party today. If the Communist Party claims to be in a privileged position and they say, "No. We are not going to let the students alone. We shall make full use of them", then naturally the Congress Party will

have to think twice and the other parties also will have to do the same thing. It is most unfortunate from the standpoint of the students but I do hope that wiser counsels will prevail and that even the Communist, in the interests of their country and in the interests of their younger brothers and sisters, will take a more reasonable attitude. And I trust that if the Government is pleased to accept this Resolution, the Communist Party will work towards it undoubtedly.

**श्रीमती उमा नेहरू (उत्तर प्रदेश) :**

सभापति जी, श्री वाजपेयी जी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है वह बहुत सुन्दर है। इस प्रस्ताव को देख कर इस बात का खयाल होता है कि इस प्रस्ताव को गहराई से देखना चाहिये और गहराई से देखने के साथ साथ यह भी देखना पड़ता है कि इस तरह का जो प्रस्ताव आया है उसका रखने वाला कौन है और इस प्रस्ताव में जो बातें कही गई हैं, जो वे कह रहे हैं, वे सब गुण उनमें हैं या नहीं। जब मैं इस प्रस्ताव को देखती हूँ तब इस तरह की सब शकयें दिल में उठती हैं। मेरे सामने सिर्फ़ प्रश्न एक है और वह यह है कि हमारे बच्चों को शिक्षा किन तरह की दी जानी चाहिये, उनको किस तरह की शिक्षा दी जा रहा है और जो शिक्षा दी जा रही है वह सही है या गलत। जब यह सवाल मेरे सामने आता है तो यह बात भी मेरे सामने आ जाती है कि इस समय हमारे बच्चों को जो शिक्षा दी जा रही है, उसका मकसद क्या है? इस शिक्षा का मतलब केवल यही है कि हम अपने लड़के-लड़कियों को स्कूलों में पढ़ायें और फिर उन्हें सरकारी नौकरियों में लगा दें। क्या हमारी पढ़ाई का यही मकसद है? शिक्षा का मतलब यह होता है कि इंसान का जो दिल व दिमाग है वह विशाल हो और उसमें इन्सानियत आ जाये। जिस समय मैं एजुकेशन की बात सोचती हूँ तो मेरे सामने बच्चे के दिल व दिमाग का

[श्रीमती उमा नेहरू]

खयाल आ जाता है। जब हम बच्चे को एजुकेशन देते हैं तो हमें यह देखना होता है कि हम बच्चे को किस तरह से एजुकेट कर रहे हैं उससे बच्चा तंग-खयाली से बचा रहे। इस तरह की शिक्षा जब हम अपने बच्चों को देते हैं तो इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि यह शिक्षा बच्चे में लड़के-लड़कियों में इन्सानियत पैदा करती है। इस तरह की चीज हमारे सामने रहती है लेकिन आज जब हम अपने बच्चों की शिक्षा को और देखते हैं तो हमें दिखाई देता है कि उनमें इन्सानियत नहीं है जो कि उनमें होनी चाहिये। फिर हमें अपने आपको देखना होता है, बच्चों के बालबैठन की तरफ देखना पड़ता है कि जब उनमें इस तरह की कमी है तो क्या हम में भी कुछ कमी है?

यहां पर इन्वैक्शन का भी जिक्र आया। जिस वक्त सिविल डिस्ओबिडियन्स मूवमेण्ट चल रहा था मैं खुद स्टूडेंटों को कॉलेज और स्कूलों से हटा कर अपने साथ जलूसमें ले गई। लेकिन उस समय के स्टूडेंट दूसरे थे। हमारा उस समय एक फारेन गवर्नमेंट से युद्ध हो रहा था और हमारी आपस की लड़ाई नहीं हो रही थी। हमारी लड़ाई अंग्रेजों से थी, और उसमें हमारे बच्चों ने भी हमारा साथ दिया। उस लड़ाई में हमारे बच्चे जेल गये, बहुत से लड़के और लड़कियां हमारे सामने जेल गईं और इस तरह से उन्होंने आजादी की लड़ाई में हिस्सा लिया। मैं आपको यहां पर बतला दू कि उस समय स्टूडेंट हमारे देश के खजाने थे। तो इन बच्चों को हमें दुस्त करवा है और मुल्क को आगे बढ़ाना है। उस जमाने के नक्शे का कुछ जिक्र यहां पर हुआ। मुझे आप से कहना है और आप सब लोग जानते हैं कि मेहात्मा गांधी ने उस समय हमारे सामने एक आइडिया रखा था, एक मकसद रखा था, एक प्रिंसिपल रखा था कि इस तरह से आप

मुल्क आजाद करा सकते हैं। उस वक्त देश के मर्दों ने ही नहीं बल्कि बच्चों, बूढ़ों, सभी ने उस में हिस्सा लिया और आजादी की लड़ाई में शामिल हो गये। जैसा कि मेरे भाई ने कहा कि उस समय हमारी हालत क्या थी। हमारे पास कुछ नहीं था और सब कुछ मेहात्मा गांधी जी ने ले लिया था। सब कुछ लेने के बाद उन्होंने हमसे काम करवाया और हम सब लोगों ने दिल व जान से काम किया। हमने अच्छी तरह से इन्वैक्शन लड़ा। हमारे पास धन नहीं था, हमने भीख मांगी और दर दर की ठोकें खाई और हमने बगैर पैसे अंग्री-कल्चरिस्ट पार्टी से इन्वैक्शन जीता। जो इन्वैक्शन उस समय हमने जीता, वह किस लिये जीता? क्योंकि एक आदर्श हमारे सामने था, एक प्रिंसिपल हमारे सामने था। हमने अपनी सेवा से, त्याग से, उस समय इन्वैक्शन जीता। लेकिन आज हम इन्वैक्शन को दूसरी नजर से देखते हैं और हम हजारों रुपया खर्च करके भी हरा नहीं सकते हैं। आज के नक्शे को देख कर तकलीफ होती है। आज नक्शा यह है कि आप जिवर भी देखिये चाहे इयर देखिये, चाहे उयर देखिये, उल्टा देखिये, सुल्टा देखिये, टेढ़े-मेढ़े, जैसे भी आदमी होते हैं, वे इन्वैक्शन में खड़े हो जाते हैं। आज धन ही सब कुछ होता है। आप अपने यहां राज्य सभा में या लोक सभा का नक्शा देखिये, किस किस तरह के लोग और कैसे लोग आये हैं। यह सब देख कर मालूम होता है कि इन लोगों के सामने कोई मकसद नहीं है इस तरह की चीज के बारे में खयाल करना बहुत जरूरी हो जाता है।

दूसरा सवाल जो यहां पर आया है और जिसका जिक्र श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने भी किया, वह कम्युनलिज्म के बारे में है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि आज देश की हालत यह है कि अगर आप गांवों में चले जाइये तो आप यह देखेंगे कि खत्री खत्री से मिल रहा है,

कायस्थ कायस्थ से मिल रहा है और अग्रवाल अग्रवाल से मिल रहा है। इस तरह के नक्शे को देख कर तकलीफ होती है। मेरी राय यह है कि अगर हमें जिन्दा रहना है, अगर इस मुल्क को जिन्दा रहना है तो जब तक इस कास्टवाद की जड़ से सफाई नहीं करेंगे तब तक हम जिन्दा नहीं रह सकते हैं। इस तरह के किस्से रोज हमारे सामने आते ही रहते हैं, इसलिये इस चीज को खत्म करना जरूरी है।

आ रहा सवाल यह कि इस वक्त हमारे सामने क्या काम है? सब लोग अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि हमारा मुल्क आजाद हो गया है और आजाद होने के बाद हमारा क्या काम होता है, यह प्रश्न हमारे सामने है। मुल्क के आजाद होने के बाद एक ही काम होता है और वह मुल्क का निर्माण करना है। जिस तरह से आजादी के समय हमने अपने विद्यार्थियों को अपने साथ लिया था उसी तरह से मुल्क के निर्माण के काम में उन्हें अपने साथ ले जाना है और अपने मुल्क का निर्माण करना है। आज हालत यह है कि हम देश को पोलिटिक्स की ओर ले जाते हैं और अपनी ही ज्यादा परवाह करते हैं। अपनी परवाह के वास्ते हम देश का विगाड़ करते हैं।

**श्री सभापति :** आप विद्यार्थियों के बारे में कहिये।

**श्रीमती उमा नेहरू :** मैं विद्यार्थियों का ही जिक्र कर रही हूँ। लेकिन विद्यार्थियों का जिक्र करते हुए मुझे कुछ झलक जड़ पर भी देनी होगी क्योंकि विद्यार्थियों की जिम्मेदार मैं हूँ और ये बेचारे कहीं से नहीं निकल पड़ें। इसलिए मुझे कहना पड़ता है कि अगर विद्यार्थियों को शुद्ध करना है तो पहले मुझे अपने को शुद्ध करना होगा। जब तक मैं अपने को शुद्ध नहीं करूँगी तब तक विद्यार्थी शुद्ध नहीं हो सकते हैं। यह चीज मैं लाना

372RS-2.

चाहता हूँ और इस चीज का लाने के लिए मुझे अपने स्कूल और कालेजों का ध्यान इस बात को ओर दिलाना है। मिनिस्टर साहब यहां पर बैठे हैं और उनकी भी कांशिश इस ओर है। लेकिन मुझे पता है कि जब लखनऊ में एजीटेशन हुआ था तो लड़कों ने सड़कों के बलब तोड़ने शुरू कर दिये थे। उस समय मैं खुद लड़कों के पास गई और उनसे कहा "भाई तुम्हारी नाराजगी तो गवर्न-मेंट से है लेकिन बरबस तो तुम्हारे हैं, ये बसेज मत जलाओ, ये सब तुम्हारी हैं"। उन लोगों को इतना ज्ञान नहीं कि ये सब चीजें हमारे मुल्क की हैं। हमारे बच्चों को अभी यह मानूँ नहीं है कि इस मुल्क में जो कुछ भी है वह सब हमारा है। हमें इस तरह की शिक्षा अपने बच्चों को देनी है कि यह मुल्क तुम्हारा है, तुम इस मुल्क के हो और तुम्हें इस मुल्क को सजाना है। इस तरह की चीज हमें विद्यार्थियों के सामने रखनी होगी।

इस चीज के साथ ही साथ यह भी गौर करना होगा कि हमारे स्कूलों में कसी पढ़ाई होती है, पढ़ाने वाले किस किस्म के होते हैं। अगर पढ़ाई ठीक होती है, पढ़ाने वाले ठीक हैं, किताबें ठीक हैं तो कोई बजह दिखाई नहीं देती कि फिर इस तरह की कम्युनल बातें हमारे विद्यार्थियों के दिमागों में फैलें। कम्युनल बात को रोकने के लिए पहली चीज यह है कि हमें अपनी शिक्षा की ओर तबज्जो देनी होगी और उस पर गौर करना होगा। ज्यादा न कह कर मैं वाजपेयी जी को मुबारक-बाद देती हूँ। मुझे यकीन है कि उन्होंने जितने लफ्फ इस्तेमाल किये वे बहुत सुन्दर हैं। लेकिन मुझे यकीन है कि पोलिटिक्स के मायने वे वहीं रखेंगे जो मैं रखती हूँ। एक्टिव पोलिटिक्स के मायने विद्यार्थियों के लिए यह हैं वे देश के निर्माण कार्य में अपना ध्यान लगायें। हमने देश को आजाद किया है और देश की सजावट करने में उनका हाथ होगा। मैं समझती हूँ कि देश की सजावट विद्यार्थियों के जरिये होना देश के लिए बहुत बड़ी चीज

[श्रीमती उमा नंहरू]

होगी। अगर हम इस बात की कातिवा करें कि हर बच्चा जो हमारा है, हर आदमी जो है, उसमें इन्सानियत पैदा हो और उसमें हैवानियत की तरह बातें न हो तो यह बहुत ही अच्छी बात होगी।

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) ; Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Resolution moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Vajpayee, though in doing so I must confess that I do not share his optimism about the outcome of such a conference of political parties. I confess to a feeling of pessimism because recently we had a meeting to evolve a scheme for national integration. That meeting was held in September last year, and a code of conduct was evolved at that conference for political parties in regard to the General Elections. And that code was honoured more in the breach than in its observance by all the political parties. I may also say here that I am not in favour of my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's amendment regarding communal parties. We have to recognise the fact that certain parties have received the approval of the electorate in some measure. As long as we have a democratic constitution, all organised parties must attend a conference of this kind, and I may tell my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that ideological fanaticism can be as bad as acrid communalism; I mean, there is not much to choose between one variety of extremism and another. Further, if we go into the question of secularism, we have to note that allegations have been made against the Ruling Party, against Opposition Parties also, that casteism plays a very prominent part in their deliberations and decisions. In any case We should not go too deep into that matter, and should allow all parties to attend a conference of this kind. Mr. Chairman, I would say that a conference of this kind cannot solve the problem that we have before us today. If students are taking active

interest in politics, it is part of a big world movement. Students have taken active interest in politics in Egypt, in Iraq and in Iran, and today, the movement of the coloured peoples in the United States is led by the students in Chicago, in Annarbor. Mr. D. D. Karve who visited the United States recently observed that it was the students who were leading the agitation against segregation.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Even in England?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes, even in England. So it is not possible for us to say that students should not take 'too active an interest in politics, but it is possible for a conference of this kind to set the limits to the interest that students can take in this matter. But, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately this problem is bound up with the general political atmosphere in the country. If students take too active an interest in politics and if their activities are harmful to the interests of the country, the politicians are as much to blame for this matter as the students. The University Grants Commission went into the problem of the indiscipline of the students in the universities and certain observations were made by them in their report on the subject which I should like to read before the House. It says:

"Frequently the behaviour of older and younger people is influenced by a desire for publicity. A considerable part of the material that newspapers print Consists of speeches and statements made by Ministers and other public men,, and there seems to be a tendency amongst certain sections of both the senior and junior members of the university to emulate the example of such persons and to wish to be mentioned in the press frequently. The readiness with which newspapers give uncritical publicity to student agitations frequently acts as a stimulus to further agitation\*."

In this matter, Sir, I would like to suggest that the Ministers may set a better example when they address public gatherings. I have addressed many college gatherings, but whenever a Minister addresses a public gathering, there is some reference to the civil disobedience movement, to the role that the Congress has played in winning the independence of the country, to the problem of national integration to see that secularism is established, and so on. Now, making statements of that kind creates a political atmosphere among the students. A self-denying ordinance ought to be passed by the Ministers on themselves, that they will not touch on active controversial issues when they address students, and if a Minister is not able to make an academic speech, it will be much better for him to drop out of any engagement where he has to address a gathering. And this applies in an equal measure to the Leaders of the Opposition also.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAYVARGIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Gandhiji's Civil Disobedience Movement had some different moral aspect.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am not giving way; I have got ten minutes only.

Now there are other points, Sir. When we think in terms of active politics, we should think of its very broad connotation. It is not only in speeches that people get involved in politics. The way in which educational institutions are run, the way in which Ministers interfere in the case of admission of students, the way in which teachers are being transferred because they do not happen to be the favourites of this person or that person, all these things come within the term 'of "active politics"'. If Ministers agree,—and I am sure my hon. friend the Minister for Education here would agree—that Ministers should keep away from direct interference in the administration of educational institutions, one of the causes which make students take active part |

in politics would have been removed. Further, Sir, we would like to see men of authority and position in the educational institutions. The way in which the Vice-Chancellors' elections are contested by political parties, where the candidates are supported by this Minister or that, has introduced a very active element of controversial politics in the universities. If the Leaders of the Opposition do not like a Vice-Chancellor, immediately the interest of the students is canalised in the party direction. We would therefore like to see that as an ancillary measure for strengthening the movement for keeping students out of politics, the Ministers

SHRI GANGA SHARAN SINHA (Bihar): It is not the Opposition Parties generally; it is the two groups in the same ruling party; they quarrel among themselves and they agitate against a Vice-Chancellor. Generally, as I said, Opposition Parties do not come in.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I accept that very often the ruling party itself, or the party which is in power in the university has a split, and one party supports one person standing as a candidate, and the 'other party supports the opposing candidate. But, Sir, I would like to suggest, if the political parties agree, that in regard to the administration of universities, in the election of Vice-Chancellors, they would try to see that men of position and learning are elected, we would have gone a long way to remove one of the causes for the present indiscipline among students. Mr. Chairman, I should like to mention that this problem of students being kept away from active politics was also considered in England. Mr. Ivor Brown, the dramatic critic and the famous writer of the lexicon of the English language, who has done a lot of research on the English language said that one of the reasons why the students of the older universities like Oxford and Cambridge kept out of politics is that they have

[Shri A. D. Marr.] lecturers of outstanding eminence, and he also said that when a person attended the class in Greek of Dr. Gilbert Murray, he forgot altogether that Dr. Gilbert Murray was speaking about a dead old past of more than fifteen hundred years ago and that he was speaking about a living message that the Hellenic people had given to the world. Now do we have lecturers of standing? One of the reasons why students are getting involved in politics is that the men we are recruiting to the staff of the colleges are not impressive, and sometimes students are better informed and more learned than the lecturers. Sir, this is a problem and I mention it because it is a very complex problem. We have to think in terms of giving a new tone to education in this country if we want to keep students out of politics.

Sir, there is one other matter which I would like to mention. The Report of the University Grants Commission referred to students' unions and a damaging statement was made in that Report, which has not been challenged. "In fact it is known that some so-called student leaders are paid by political parties." This Report was signed by two student leaders, Mr. Jyoti Shankar Singh, who was a representative of the National Council of University Students of India, and Shri K. N. Sharma. A statement of this kind would not have been made unless there was evidence to show that the political parties were financing the activities of the students' Unions.

Sir, I have always been of the opinion that in view of so much money being spent on these elections the time has come for the adoption of legislation by Parliament under which political parties would be under an obligation to declare their expenditure before the public. We do not like the Companies Act to go into the veracity or otherwise of the statement made, but we must have an idea of

how the political parties are spending money and whether they are spending money on students' Unions. The second move will go a long way—this ought to be a subject of discussion at a conference—to help restore academic atmosphere in the University.

There is one other point that I would like to mention. Sir, while we are of opinion that students should not take part in politics, there is a reservation in our mind about certain movements in which we want the students to join. Protests against nuclear bombs and nuclear tests we are led by students all over the world—When we want to condemn nuclear tests we do not mind dragging in the students. The other point on which we want students' co-operation is the Afro-Asian Conference which has got very active roots in the Universities. It will give a lot of satisfaction to my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, to learn that the leaders of the Afro-Asian movement very often see eye to eye with the leaders of the Communist Party, and on many matters, it will be a matter of satisfaction to my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, they have been able to extend their influence amongst students. I should like to ask whether even on international matters . . .

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): That is because we are anti-imperialist.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Whatever it is. I would like to ask whether it is necessary even for political parties for broad national purposes to drag students into these matters. Sir, I trust that this conference, if it is convened, will go into the matter of the whole educational system.

Sir, one of the reasons why students are unhappy and why there is lot of frustration amongst themselves has been attested to by the University Grants Commission and by foreign observers who have come here. One of the observers who came from the U.K. says that what India requires is



a youth hostels movement as a sort of safeguard against the teddy boys. These things have been said in the past. We really would like to have a reorientation of our educational system. If such a reorientation comes as a result of this conference, I will be very happy, but I am extremely doubtful whether any code of conduct agreed to at a conference of this kind will be honoured by the political parties who are signatories to the agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call the next speaker, I might inform you that I have more than twenty names before me and a shorter speech than 15 minutes can be as good as a 15 minute speech. Therefore, if you can arrange amongst yourselves and take less time, maybe, most of us who are anxious to speak may be able to speak. Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the intention of the Resolution moved by my esteemed friend, Mr. Vajpayee, is to keep students out of active politics. He prefaced his remarks by saying that his Resolution has to be considered in the context of time. Personally, a resolution which has an outspoken intention of keeping students out of active politics is somewhat distasteful to me.

Sir, I happen to be a teacher and if my esteemed friend, Prof. Wadia, has spent his whole life-time, I have also spent thirty years in this line. I happen to come from the University of Calcutta which is one of the most agitated centres of students' movements. In fact, if I am not wrong, student movements as movements took their cue from the streets and lanes and by-lanes of Calcutta.

I am opposed to such an intention of any resolution, first of all ideologically, because I do believe that students learn as much in the class room

as they do in the rough and tumble of life, and I have always believed that if politics is a large segment of anybody's life, one should not be out of it in his or her formative years of life.

I also am against the intention of such a resolution because of my personal upbringing. I have been in politics since I was sixteen, a politics of a very dangerous kind, as you know, in Bengal of those days, and since then I have never given up politics. I had been actively associated with politics as a student, and I have been actively associated with politics as a teacher. Whenever any mass movement came in, w

Whenever any national movement came in, I just went to the authorities and said, "I am out for the time being." I participated actively in all national surges as late as 1942. When the call came, I went to the then Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerji, and told him, "Look here. I am out of the University for the time being". Then when I was released after a prison-life of months I went back to the University and resumed my work.

I have never believed that politics and academic life are antithetic and, personally, I must confess that I have learnt much from politics. I might humbly say that I have not been either a bad student or a bad teacher, and if I have made any contribution to politics, maybe very little, I have also contributed something to scholastic life producing at least more than half a dozen books, written and printed more than 6,000 pages. Indeed, politics and education had never been antithetical, so far as I am concerned. Therefore, I do not believe that students should be kept out of politics. This is so far as the theoretical aspect of the thing is concerned.

Sir, when we speak about students taking part in politics, we are speaking in the context of time. It is true and

[Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.] we all know that in most of our colleges and Universities, especially, in Northern India, there are students' demonstrations of a very disturbing nature. Now, students' demonstrations have been there before independence and after independence. After independence, students' movements between 1949 and 1954 have been of one kind. The nature of the movements, the character of the agitations have been changing since then. I am seeing the changes before my own eyes. I am just fresh from one agitation of the Medical College students in the University of Calcutta which has ended happily the day before I left for Delhi. I have seen such things elsewhere also where too the character of students' agitation, in our colleges and in our Universities is changing.

You are thinking in terms of political activities of students. Do not take me amiss if I say that I have been noticing for some time past that our students are becoming depoliticalised. Perhaps you don't know it. Mix with the students and analyse the character of the student movements. You would find it easily. It is very unfortunate indeed that our students are gradually becoming depoliticalised. They are no more interested in the burning political questions and the international issues of the time. Their agitations are running in a very undisciplined way. It is a part of the universal indiscipline of the times. It is a social symptom. We cannot take it away from the context of other things. It has been said here that students are as much to blame as the teachers themselves and the political leaders . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: And the guardians.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Yes, and the guardians. I agree. But I want to say that this teddy-boy at-

mosphere and environment we are seeing in the Indian cities is symptomatic of the times. In most of the large and small towns and cities the number of teddy boys is growing. Students' movements today are taking place in this atmosphere. May-be the students are airing their legitimate grievances. And here I must say that their grievances are not always illegitimate. They have sometimes legitimate grievances and when they agitate over them, these teddy boys get mixed up with the movement and they take the lead. Students' movements everywhere are losing their right lead. They are nowhere disciplined as before. Student movements, some years back, some four or five years back, were disciplined movements and it was not very difficult for us, at least for those teachers whom the students held in some reverence and esteem, to deal with them. Personally I did not meet with any difficulty in dealing with such movements. But now we are finding it increasingly difficult, because it is no longer a disciplined students' movement. Therefore, the whole thing has to be understood in its proper context. The psychology of the students has to be understood. Do not put the entire blame on the students and say that our students have become undisciplined. It is not just true. It is only because we cannot manage them, because we do not deal with them sympathetically and because we cannot canalise their extra energy into right directions. You know the atmosphere in the schools and colleges or in the universities. How many schools and colleges have their recreation halls? How many their re-creation halls? How many of them have their common rooms? How many of them have any elbow-room to enable the students to put into operation their extra energy of youth? When extraneous forces, that is, political parties try to exploit them for their own ends, it is only then that the students get out of the teachers' Control. Personally, I have tried to analyse these student move-

Jiients in Calcutta during the last five or six years, and I have always found that the political leaders, the leaders of the different political parties, try to exploit the situation in which students get agitated over something. And it is only then that the students get out of control of the teachers. Personally I agree with Mr. Mani when he says that there is an atmosphere of indiscipline in the universities. We cannot help it. We teachers or the students cannot help it, if with the change of government in a State four Vice-Chancellors get changed, as it did in a certain State. We cannot help it if there are all sorts of interference from the government or from political parties or from some other extraneous sources. When such things happen, then naturally the students' respect for the teachers and university authorities is undermined. I heard Mr. Mani utter a sentence. He said that there are certain students who know much more than their teachers. That may be a fact or not. But did he realise that an utterance of this kind at once undermines the students' respect for teachers. A stray utterance of this kind takes away the entire good effect of a speech. We do make such stray utterances daily and thereby undermine our values.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Is it not a fact?

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: It may be a fact, it may not be a fact. But all facts are not truths.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Fortunately students do not read our speeches.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Yes, that is the only saving part of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All facts are not mentionable.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: What I submit is that this is a very well-intentioned Resolution; but in the context of time again, I do feel that a Resolution of this kind would serve no

purpose. This problem is being discussed at various levels, by the University Grants Commission, by various other bodies, in the enquiry committees' reports on more than one University and so on, and also recently in the National Integration Council. This is a very important item indeed included in the discussions of the National Integration Council. This problem should be thoroughly gone into. It is not so simple as we think. We cannot find a solution to a problem of this kind by making speeches or by passing resolutions on the floor of Parliament. It should be gone into a little more deeply and sympathetically. There are many questions involved in it, social, psychological, personal and collective, and I believe the whole thing should go before the National Integration Council with whatever comments we may make here and that will be the right body to go into the question.

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I would like to apologise to you and to the House for not being in my seat at the time you called out my name for moving my amendment. I was labouring under the impression that the matter would come up at 12 o'clock. I was not aware that there was no Question Hour today.

Anyway, I would like to take this opportunity to explain the purpose of my amendments. I am one of those who believe that the conduct of political parties should be regulated not only by convention but if necessary even by statute. For that I have been pleading for some time now. So if the purpose of the proposed conference were to summon all the parties and hammer out a code of conduct, not only hammer out a code of conduct but also set up an organisation to enforce that code of conduct, then that would be something. It may be said that there is already the National Integration Council. But with due deference to the sponsors of that

[bhr; Mohan *Lai* baKsenaj Council, I may point tout—as I had pointed it out after that Conference —that I did not expect it to serve the purpose it was expected to serve. I had written like this in an article:

"For a number of years I have been pleading for the formulation of a code of conduct for political parties and persons in public life with a view to safeguard freedom and democracy. So I am glad the Conference has taken certain steps in that direction. But the formulation of such codes takes time and their implementation still more. Notwithstanding the agreement of the leaders of important parties I am doubtful whether even the principal political parties will faithfully follow it during the general elections."

"As regards the Integration Council, I may only say that to me it appears a practical joke that the Council which, in the words of the Prime Minister himself .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Are we discussing political parties?

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENT: No, we are discussing what the parties should or should not do:

"... is supposed to advise and influence the Government should principally consist of the Union Ministers, the Chief Ministers and other Government employees with the Prime Minister as its Chairman. However, I wish it well. Time alone would show how much time its members will find from their other preoccupations and responsibilities for the difficult and urgent task which they have undertaken."

So, my apprehensions have come true. I had been pleading for the setting up of an all-parties organisation just on the lines of the United Nations where all the parties might be represented through their accredited representatives and after decisions are taken, it should be the responsibility

of the all-parties organisation to enforce that code of conduct. Just as the United Nations Organisation has got a charter, it should have a charter. However, this is not being done and I still hope that in view of the experience we have had during the last General Elections some such organisation will be set up. Otherwise, it would not bode well for democracy in this country.

Now, coming to the Resolution, Mr. Vajpayee wants a conference to be called only for one purpose. I think there is no need for such a conference for under the Constitution there is a definite provision laid down in the Directive Principles of State Policy, namely article 39(f) which says:

"that childhood and youth are protected against exploitation and against moral and material abandonment."

As we are aware, this particular article cannot be enforced as the Fundamental Rights in a court of law but the State Governments are expected to implement them to the best of their ability. Not only this but later on also we have a similar provision that boys and girls under the age of fourteen will be provided with free and compulsory education by the end of 1960, that is, within ten years of the coming into force of the Constitution. The idea behind it was that children born after the advent of independence should have provision for education by the end of 1960 but that provision has not been implemented because, as the House is aware, we are only thinking in terms of boys and girls up to eleven years who are expected to be in schools by the end of the Third Plan. So, my submission is that there is no point in calling such a conference. This is a duty which is laid upon the Government. I was not present here when Mr. Bhupesh Gupta spoke but I am not opposed to any political party going and addressing the students but what I am opposed to is that they should not be exploited. They should not be made a pawn in

the game of party politics. The youth of a country is its biggest asset and I do not want the youth to be spoiled. I have been in touch with the students not only now but even in the non-co-operation days. It is always given as an example that at that time also we had exploited the students. Well, I cannot agree with that. We never did that.

The moment we called the students to leave schools we immediately took steps to make provision for their studies. We never sent them round shouting at election time as we find nowadays children going round and shouting and paid a few annas. The students are being used in the University politics also as pawns and are being exploited. It is the duty of the Government, not of any conference that we might call, to take the necessary steps to see that the students are not exploited. The previous speaker said that he would like the students to be educated in politics. I do not mind the students being educated in politics but I have every objection to their taking active part in politics while studying. If anything, they must prepare for the life to come. There is an English saying, "Take care of the pennies and the pound will take care of itself". Similarly, if we take care of the children and youth, the whole nation will take care of itself but in order to serve our shortsighted ends we forget the long-range and desirable objective. When it was put to Mahatma Gandhi, he said, "I would like the students even now to come but I want them to study and prepare for the life to come". I shall narrate my experience of the Lucknow University. I was invited to address the University students but I had told them I did not believe in simply making speeches and I enquired of them about the work that they were doing. I asked the students what they were doing about co-operation. A Professor said that they had started a co-operative kitchen but added that they had to give it up. He said that the students were running it and the student who sat first would take more than his share and so on till nothing was left

for those sitting at the end. I told them in the co-operative kitchen, every boy had sufficient and equal share and if this is their attitude in the student life, when they come outside where articles are in short supply what would be their attitude? We have to teach them and we have to train them in the work that they have to

undertake. I would ask Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—he is not here—whether he would address even students under eighteen. But I would not. I do not like them to take part in any controversy or active politics. They may be addressed and they may take part in constructive work and they may be prepared for the coming life but for us to use them, as pawns in our election campaign or to serve our personal ends, is highly objectionable and Government should take effective measures to put an end to this. That is the reason why I gave notice of two amendments. Firstly, I am not in favour of this conference because it is not necessary. It is not that I do not want all the parties to come together. I want them to come together and have a code of conduct and set up an organisation to enforce this code of conduct. But for this purpose, I do not think a conference is necessary. In my second amendment I had suggested that all boys and girls under fourteen should also be included, not only students who are being taught in the schools and who should be protected from these influences but all those boys and girls who could not be provided with even elementary education. Even they have got to be protected. I would once again request you, when the motion comes to be put to the vote, to give me special permission to move those amendments so that the Resolution may be considered . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot do that, as I told you before. You have expressed your views and they will be taken note of.

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA: With these words, I conclude my speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN; The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-part two of the clock. THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.

**श्री प्रतुल चन्द्र मिश्र (बिहार):** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो प्रस्ताव लाया गया है, इसका मैं विरोध करता हूँ, इसलिए कि प्रस्तावक महोदय ने अपने आप यह कहा है कि यह जो प्रस्ताव म लाया हूँ, यह जो स्टूडेंट्स २१ वर्ष से उम्र में ज्यादा हैं, उनके ऊपर लागू नहीं किया जायेगा। दूसरे प्रस्तावक महोदय को स्वस्थ राजनीति से कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। तो राजनीति गन्दी चीज है, यह हम क्यों मान लें। प्रस्तावक को चाहिये कि वे प्रस्ताव में इस तरीके से सुधार करें कि स्टूडेंट्स को गन्दी राजनीति से अलग रखा जाये। मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि राजनीति कोई खराब चीज नहीं है। मैं बचपन से राजनीति में हूँ। मैं नहीं समझता कि राजनीति ऐसी चीज है कि यदि लड़के उसमें शामिल हों तो वे खराब हो जायेंगे। लेकिन अभी जिस तरीके से उनको बहकाया जाता है, उसको राजनीति नहीं कहा जा सकता। उसी को अगर आप राजनीति का नाम देते हैं तो वह गलत है। तो आप उसे सबवर्सिव ऐक्टिविटी या और कोई शब्द लगाइये और उसको राजनीति मत बोलिये। इसलिए मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ।

इस प्रस्ताव के जो संशोधन आये हैं उनसे भी बात साफ हो जाती है कि आप जो चाहते हैं वह होने को नहीं है। आप चाहते हैं कि मेजर पोलिटिकल पार्टीज समझौता करें। इससे किस तरीके से छात्र राजनीति से अलग रह सकते हैं। जो पार्टीज छात्रों को ज्यादा उभारने वाली हैं उनमें मेजर पोलि-

टिकल पार्टीज में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी आती है। छात्रों को उभार कर के और हल्ला मचाद करा कर के कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग कहते हैं कि हमने छात्रों को राजनीति में शामिल किया है। वे अपने आप कहते हैं कि हम किसी हालत में इस समझौते में नहीं रहेंगे। तो जिन का काम उस तीके का है, वही नहीं रहेंगे तो आपका उद्देश्य पूरा नहीं हुआ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जिस राजनीति में हम आप सब हैं, उसमें हम कोई गन्दी चीज न लायें और इसी की कोशिश सबसे पहले हम लोगों को करनी चाहिये। जैसा हम करेंगे वैसा ही एक छोटा बच्चा सीखेगा क्योंकि छोटे बच्चे की आदत नकल करने की होती है। अगर हम अपना स्वभाव बदल लेंगे और अच्छा काम करेंगे तो छोटा बच्चा भी वही अच्छा काम करेगा। हम लोग बचपन से छात्र आन्दोलन में रहे। लेकिन आज छात्र आन्दोलन के नाम से जो हो रहा है, इस तरीके का आन्दोलन पहले नहीं था। आज यह होता है कि इम्तिहान के प्रश्न के बारे में विद्यार्थी जा करके मास्टर से जबरदस्ती करते हैं या कौन दिन इम्तिहान होगा, कौन दिन नहीं होगा, इसके लिए वाइस चांसलर को रूद करते हैं। पहले भी बहुत से छात्रों ने राजनीति में भाग लिया था। खुदी राम बीस और गोपी नाथ शाहा, ये सब कौन थे? वे कितनी उम्र के थे जो देश के लिए बलिदान हो गये और जिन्होंने देश को आजादी दिलाई। आज हम अगर कहें कि छात्र राजनीति से अलग रहें तो मैं नहीं समझता कि यह कोई अच्छी बात है। ज़रूरत यह है कि हमको अपने आपको सुधारना चाहिये और राजनैतिक पार्टियों को सुधारना चाहिये और हमको ऐसा काम करना चाहिये कि अगर कोई बच्चा भी उस काम को करे तो वह खराब न हो।

इसके साथ साथ एक आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि यह प्रस्ताव जो विरोधी पार्टी की ओर से आया है इसमें राजनैतिक पार्टियों

की बात कही गई है। अब अगर छात्र राजनैतिक पार्टियों में न जायें तो वे साम्प्रदायिक पार्टियों में जा सकते हैं। आप कहते हैं कि राजनैतिक पार्टियां ऐसा न करें, लेकिन साम्प्रदायिक पार्टी या जातीय पार्टी कोई हो तो उसमें कोई रुकावट नहीं होगी ; इसलिए जो चीज अच्छी है उसी को हमें देखना चाहिये और आज जो प्रस्ताव आया, ऐसा प्रस्ताव न ला करके हमको ऐसी कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि किस तरह से अनुशासन के अन्दर विद्यार्थी रहें। इसी बात पर विचार करने के लिए राजनैतिक पार्टी ही नहीं, सब विद्वान और समझदार लोग एक जगह बैठें और यह देखें कि लड़के किस तरह से अनुशासन के अन्दर रह सकते हैं।

आपने मिशन के स्कूल या कालेज देखे होंगे। हमने देखा है कि आज छात्र आन्दोलन के नाम से जो होता है उसमें मिशन के स्कूल और कालेज के लड़के बहुत कम शरीक होते हैं क्योंकि वहां के शिक्षक वगैरह उनको इस तरह से शिक्षा देते हैं कि उनका समय फालतू कामों में जाया न हो। उनका कोचिंग क्लास अलग होता है और जो समय उनके पास बचता है वह खेले कूद में लगाया जाता है ; इस तरह उनमें दूसरी ओर बहकने की संभावना बहुत कम रहती है। हमारे यहां अभी क्या होता है ? शिक्षक भी डिमांडेशन करते हैं और हड़ताल करते हैं। अब आप विद्यार्थियों से कैसे उम्मीद करते हैं कि वह राजनीति में भाग न ले जब कि उसका शिक्षक राजनैतिक पार्टियों में शामिल होता है। फिर हमने शिक्षकों के लिए स्पेशल कांस्टिट्यूंसीज बनाई हैं और उनके लिए विधान परिषदों में रिजर्वेशन कर दिया है। जब शिक्षक को हम राजनीति में लाते हैं और शिक्षक भी आन्दोलन करते हैं, तो विद्यार्थी उससे क्या सीखेंगे। शिक्षकों ने जिस तरीके से कलकत्ता में आन्दोलन किया, उसको लोगों ने देखा है। इसके बाद आप समझते हैं कि ऐसे शिक्षकों के जो छात्र हैं, विद्यार्थी हैं, वे क्या कोई दूसरा काम

करेंगे। इसीलिए खाली राजनैतिक पार्टी ही नहीं, सभी समझदार लोगों को बैठ करके यह कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि किस तरीके से छात्रों के अन्दर अनुशासन बढ़े और इसी का विचार हो।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ।

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I congratulate Shri Vajpayee for succeeding in the ballot to bring this important Resolution before the House because the subject which is covered by this Resolution is a very important subject and it has been hotly discussed in the country. The National Integration Council also in its recent meeting considered this question in some detail. Newspapers are writing editorials and editorial notes on this subject and therefore it is but proper that this House also should have an opportunity for considering this subject of relationship between students and politics in its various aspects, and the Members might have an opportunity to express themselves on this important issue. While therefore congratulating him for standing first in the ballot, I cannot agree with the Resolution which he has moved. The idea behind the Resolution is to prevent students from taking part in active politics. Now, it is neither possible nor desirable to do so. I would not agree with my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, when he says that this particular concept of preventing students from taking part in active politics is an authoritarian concept, because even in authoritarian States, the Governments are all free to utilise students for the State and for political ends. The students are inculcated in the major values in which those States believe and they are encouraged to participate in the various activities that lead to the fulfilment of those values. Not only that. They are actively encouraged also to be on the lookout for those who are opposed to those values and to report to

[Shri Rohit M. Dave.] the office the activities of the people who are opposed to the accepted values of the community and, therefore, are undesirable. Even in democratic countries students are freely inculcated in the various values which are considered to be their major and key values and they are even taught to hate certain values which they consider are not quite proper. Now, once you create a love for one pattern of values and a hatred for another pattern of values, just to keep it within the bounds of a psychological fence and not allow it to be translated into action, would be an impossible task, because situations might arise when the passionately-held beliefs might lead people to take certain other action and to that extent it will be absolutely impossible to keep students out of active politics. Yet the community passionately believes in certain values and takes active steps to see that these values are inculcated among the students. Nor to my mind it would be quite possible to "keep students out of what is known as party politics. In the good old liberal days, when democracies were only consenting democracies, it might have been possible for the students to leisurely read books on politics to form certain ideas and beliefs in terms of that knowledge and stop at that. But we have definitely entered into an era of participating democracy and in a participating democracy, day in and day out, citizens are called upon to take an active part in certain activities which might lead to the desired goals. The various political parties have different views regarding the way in which that participation should take place. It is but natural that the students should know about these various programmes and policies. Again, once a particular programme and policy is forcibly inculcated in the minds of the people, to hope that it will merely remain in the domain of beliefs and ideas and would not overflow into action under a given circumstance would be rather a vain hope. There-

fore, it would be very difficult and almost impracticable to keep students out completely from active politics, or even party politics. Nor to my mind is it desirable that it should be so. It has been pointed out by previous speakers that knowledge and the process of acquiring knowledge does not merely consist in the reading of books. In the humble walks of life, in the day-to-day tumble of life, it is always possible for a man to acquire knowledge, which is very vital for him in order to make himself a citizen of democracy. Therefore, he has to get an active knowledge of the life around him and to that extent it is desirable that he should participate in at least some of the activities which might be considered active political life.

Again, no useful purpose will be served by keeping students out of politics if it is desired that the students should not take to agitational activities even in cases in which their own problems are involved. Students are likely to take to agitational activities, again, under certain circumstances. The question of pulling o" chains was referred to. It certainly is not desirable. Large numbers of passengers are inconvenienced because of a particular grievance of a group of students. But I can conceive of circumstances in which I would heartily appreciate even the pulling of chains, assuming that the students have exhausted all possible avenues of bringing their grievances to the attention of the authorities and the inconvenience caused to them is of such a nature that it is intolerable. Under those circumstances, if the students take to some agitational activity, perhaps it would be permissible. I do not know how we can draw a distinction between a citizen and a student regarding agitational activities as such. Irresponsible activities, agitational or otherwise, are as bad for a citizen as they are for a student. They have to be discouraged, they have to be prohibited and they have to be punished. But there is nothing very peculiar regarding



the activities of the students which would justify the claim that they should not be permitted to take to agitational activities also. The point that I want to make out is that in all circumstances, for the various purposes for which these groups are formed, there are certain limits, limits which are prescribed by the beliefs and values in society, in the active rules that have been framed in order to give shape to those activities and by the capacity of the leaders of that particular community—be it the student community, be they trade unions, be they peasants' unions, be they political parties and so on—to set reasonable limits to the activities of the various organisations. The real question, therefore, is not to prevent students from taking part in active politics or even in party politics. The real problem is to define the limits beyond which students should not go, if they are to fulfil the task that they have undertaken in the community. One major task of the student is to grasp as objectively as possible the knowledge which is available and to understand the processes whereby this knowledge could be made useful to the society, could be maintained and furthered. Now it is the function of a worker to carry out the activities of the industrial unit in which he is engaged. It is also the work of a manager to see that the industrial unit which is under his charge properly functions. In each one of these cases normally the task of the person concerned consists of minding the duties which he has undertaken, and it requires certain exceptional circumstances in which he abandons that activity and takes to some other activity, because he as an individual or as a citizen and as a conscientious citizen at that of the community considers it his duty to leave his normal functions and take to certain other functions—we might call them agitational functions, we might call them active politics, we might call them party politics, and so on. As far as the students are concerned, these limits have to be more rigid because of the fact that

the students have to acquire a sense of criticality, a sense of rationality and a sense of objectivity. If he is to acquire this analytical knowledge and develop it further, he has to be above prejudices and above passions as far as possible. Moreover by continuous association with activities of an agitational type he might develop irrationality, he might develop passions and he might develop partisan sentiments, and to that extent it is desirable that he should involve himself in active politics as little as possible. But to say that these limits should be imposed either by the political parties or by the Government is to give undue importance to the political parties and the Government. The real authority to deal with this aspect is the educational authority, the university, the school authority, the teachers, the professors, and so on. It is their duty to set the limits taking into consideration the need for a full development of the student not only through books but also through actions and also taking into consideration the need for developing a rational and objective attitude to life. Taking both these facts into consideration if the educational authority prescribes the limits beyond which the students generally and in normal circumstances should not go and, what is more important, develops sufficient sanction and authority to impose those particular rules and to persuade the students to accept those rules of conduct, it should be possible for the students to live as full and active citizens and at the same time to carry on the special functions of the vehicles of knowledge and traditions of the community in which they are born, in which they live, in which they work and hope to work in the future as full-fledged citizens and whose traditions and knowledge they have undertaken to carry further.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, when

I was hearing the debate on this Resolution, the first reaction that came to me was that this House should

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.] be thankful to my esteemed friend, Shri Vajpayee, for bringing this matter before the House where we can discuss the different aspects of this problem which is agitating the minds of the people, especially of those who are associated with the universities. Sir, as Dr. Ray pointed out, I had also the good fortune in 1920 to decide personally whether to give up education in response to the call of Mahatmaji or to continue education. I was in the fourth year and a few months were there for the final examination, but after considering all the aspects I and quite a number of other students came to the conclusion that this was an occasion when we should give up education and join the national movement.

My friend, Shri Vajpayee, made it clear that there were occasions when national movements did call upon the students to join and participate, but now when we are independent, we have to concentrate on the building up of the country. As was also very correctly pointed out by Shrimati Uma Nehru, what we have to think and concentrate upon is to build up our country economically and through all other sources so that we may meet the challenge of ignorance and poverty of our country. But the question is, in order to achieve that object, first of all is it desirable in the changed circumstances now to keep the students separate from the general currents of political thoughts of the country and of the international situation, or should we prescribe conditions that they should not take part in these matters but keep themselves absolutely isolated until they leave the university forum. In consideration of the fact of democracy and adult franchise, in consideration of the various economic and other problems that we have to face—and with all respect that I have for Professor Wadia and other very senior professors and I was anxious to hear Prof. M. B. Lai—we have

come to a certain conclusion—that students should not be kept out of healthy politics—where we have drawn a distinction between the things that are happening in some of the universities particularly

in Uttar Pradesh, whether they are denominational or otherwise, and I have no doubt that that has really agitated the mind of my friend, Shri Vajpayee who in his calm moments would have thought that the things that were moving were certainly detrimental to the best interests of our country and other general currents of thought. But then what is the remedy? These are things which we have seen in some of the universities. If you really go into it as it has been suggested, it is mainly due to the fact that the university atmosphere is not there. In most of the things we do not keep up the standards also in politics which as citizens we 3 P.M. have to keep up. We try to take advantage of the students for personal reasons—If it is to enlighten the students on the principles, then I think that even my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, will welcome the fact that our students who will be going to take up the responsibility of running the State should from the very beginning be attuned to and associated with all these problems actively. So, we have to demarcate the line. If by politics he means local politics or university politics or politics in which personalities are involved whether it is the Vice-Chancellor or the professor or the lecturer, then, of course, I entirely associate with him in his view. And I think the Government of India has been giving thought to this problem through the National Integration Council, through the Sampurnanand Committee, through the Sri Prakasa Committee and other Committees, and I think it is good that this matter should receive further detailed consideration, so that we may be able to evolve a certain machinery through which we can see that our students are led on healthy lines and that our professors establish a model, a model of great respect as in the olden days.

And if that situation is created, I think the real incentive that my esteemed friend intends to give through this Resolution will be met and met successfully. But it is a general Resolution and he asks that the door of politics be closed to them. When I say 'polities', I mean the politics of the country, I mean international politics, I mean the different economic currents that are going on. So far as these things are concerned, I do feel that they should be associated with them and there should be full opportunities for them. Let the leaders go and speak to the students, not to canvass for their party membership, not to canvass for some petty things, but to explain to them their point of view. Let the Jan Sangh leader say to them that this is the programme and he wants them to understand it. Let Mr. Bhupesh Gupta go and say that this is the programme that should be pursued in the country. And as pointed out by Dr. Sapru in connection with the speech of my esteemed friend, the Mover, in England, in Cambridge, in Oxford and I think in all the modern universities, all the political leaders go and explain their points of view to the students. So, it has got a very educative value which must be built up.

Now, Sir, the one thing that I would like to submit in this connection is that so far as the question of communal politics or uolitics which have been established to be most injurious to the interests of the country is concerned, I think we must find **out** ways and means to keep them out. It is very difficult to lay down what communal parties are and what communal politics are. But I would say that broadly they concern parties that agitate on the pattern of religion, parties that agitate on the basis of sectarianism and parties that agitate on the basis of problems that divide the country. It is high time that we took note of these, and we should do all in our power to see that that atmosphere is absolutely controlled.

So, that point also, I think, will have to be borne in mind when we lay down certain principles, certain rules, in order to improve the condition of the students.

One more point, Sir. I entirely agree that so far as this agitation which sometimes perturbs our mind is concerned, it is mostly confined to Arts side students and not to Science and Technological Department students. Why is it so? Let us try to understand it. So far as the engineering students and students of polytechnics or of even medicine are concerned, they have got a certain objective before them. They know what will be their future, and that also controls them.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: It is not always the case.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Generally speaking, B:i so far as the Arts side students are concerned, one of the reasons is—and I hope that Dr. Ray will agree with me—that they do not know their future after their education. So, there is a greater tendency for them to take part in such activities which may be considered not desirable. So, regarding such students, you will have to see and canalise their energy into proper channel so that they may also feel that they have got a future. It is true that when the independence movement was "being conducted under the leadership of Gandhiji, much energy was created and everybody made sacrifices and there was no question of any personal interest. But now, there is a more important problem and that has to be stressed on all occasions, that is, we have to build up the country and there is this question of removing poverty and ignorance. And that atmosphere should be created in our students. That objective should be emphasised and stressed that they have got a mission to carry out. And what is that mission? That mission is to build up the country. And I am sure that if this fact is impressed and

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.] stressed upon them in the proper manner, our students, our coming generation, will certainly take to it and if a good example is set by other senior citizens, by the leaders of the different parties, that they have got a mission to build up the country and that all should be united as they were in order to get independence from the foreign rulers, it will be followed. These matters should be cleared up and I have no doubt that the Education Ministry is considering the question. In the Consultative Committee and other Committees, if necessary, let this matter be taken up at one or two sittings where all the parties are represented and discussed. If after that also my hon. friend thinks that such a conference is necessary, I have nothing to object to, but what I feel is the problem is there. But let it be tackled in the Educational Committee and then, if necessary, you can take it up in the Consultative Committee, and later on, if necessary, you can call a conference of the leaders.

With these observations, Sir, I give my partial support to this Resolution.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, having been the head of two large colleges and the head of one university in times when students were called upon to take an active part in politics, I may have something useful to say on this occasion. My feeling, my conviction, then was that this invitation which was extended to students to come out of the colleges and schools and take part in the Civil Disobedience Movement was one that would recoil on the leaders of those movements themselves and I am seeing that prophecy fulfilled. It is indeed a very diverting experience to see the poacher turned game-keeper and the sinner preaching against sin. But very often the experience of Congress leaders, who have preached to present-day student gatherings that they should not take an active part in politics, is that they have met with the assertion that it is you, gentlemen, that asked us to take an active part in politics.

But still it is no use blaming or complaining or crying over spilt milk. The problem is there and it has to be dealt with. There are certain elementary fundamental facts that must be borne in mind in coming to a decision on this matter. Students, as the Latin phrase goes, are *in statu pupillari*; that is to say, they are in the condition of pupils, and pupils according to the old Roman Law definition are wards. They are in the condition of wards; they are not full-grown citizens when they are in college, when they are *in statu pupillari* and therefore, while they should be taught all that has to be taught about politics, about political subjects, they are not in a position to take an active part in political movements because they are not yet citizens. I am speaking of those students who are under the age of 21, and the majority of students in our colleges and universities are under the age of 21. That they should learn all they can about politics and political subjects is a proposition with which no one will disagree. They ought to be encouraged to read on political subjects; they ought to be encouraged to discuss political subjects in their debating societies, in their colleges and in their university unions. But what I protest against is their being invited to take part in active politics, in political movements, in movements which seek to achieve certain political ends because, in the first place, they have not got the maturity of mind, they have not got especially the experience of life, the experience of facts which will enable them to take a useful part in these movements. As a result, they will be only passive participants in these movements, being made use of by older politicians for their own political purposes. And after all, Sir, what is the political action to which students are invited? They are invited to take part in processions, in demonstrations, in strikes, sometimes also in electioneering. And what does our electioneering come to? Candidates are chosen on account of their communal or caste affiliations. Candidates are chosen on account of the money that they can spend on the

elections. Is it to this kind of political movements that our students are to be invited? It will demoralise them; it will teach them all the dirty things that are done in political movements by adults now-a-days. On the other hand, if they spend their time studying politics, studying economics and taking part in all those activities that are open to students in the colleges and in the universities, they would be preparing themselves, they would be strengthening their intellectual, not to speak of their physical and political, muscles and nerves so that when the day comes they will be able to play a useful part in politics. And this is one defect in the organisation of our college and university life that I should like to point to at this moment. Students have very few opportunities for exercising their animal and intellectual spirits. It is one dull lecture after another, very often cut by the Students with proxy attendance being given in order to earn the attendance that is necessary for procuring the certificate that will allow them to sit for the university examinations.

Look at their hostel life. Fifteen years after the War was over, we still find, in the majority of hostels, three or four students living in a room which was intended for only one. How can any decent social life be possible under such circumstances, three or four students packed into a room which was meant for one student? And there are no institutions, no activities in which they can take a useful part. They are not given representative institutions in which they can make known their grievances and in which they can be allowed to organise part of the discipline of the hostel or of the college or of the classroom. Student life is made as dull as possible, as unattractive as possible. And then people are surprised that students take to political demonstrations, political processions. It is because they want some outlet for their animal spirits, and in the absence of such outlets in the university they go outside. Look at how the political activity of students is organised elsewhere,

372 RS.—3.

At the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, first of all the unions, unlike the unions in this country, are restricted only to those who want to join the union who want to enjoy the advantages of the union, who are prepared to pay a special subscription, and the Cambridge or the Oxford union, as any other university union, is a regular club where they have their own library, their own reading room, their own newspaper room and their own debating hall, where they elect their own officers, the president, the secretary and the librarian of the union; students are given an outlet for exercising their activities, whereas few of these things obtain in our country, and the result is they take to political movements, which gives them some kind of outlet for their spirits. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta resented this proposition because, he said, it is taking away students from their legitimate ambition of taking part in the great political life of the country. Unfortunately he referred to the Hitler youth movement in Germany.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, I did not refer to that.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: He used to say students . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All I said was that I was reminded of the idea of Hitler, that for women there must be kitchen, creche and children. I said something like that.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: But Hitler organised also a youth movement; Hitler did it and that gives you an example of what politicians do when they get hold of the youth. And the German youths were taught from the very beginning to brutalise themselves, to brutalise social and political life, to use all the brutal methods which Hitler made popular to Germany, and there lies the danger of allowing immature students to take part in active politics.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Reaction always tries to use the student.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Yes, yes, *H>* does the Communist. (Interruption) And there is naturally the attraction between youth and communism, because youth is attracted by the idealism of communism, its aim to attain social justice, to attain social equality, (Interruption), to attain maximum prosperity in the quickest possible time, without knowing the means and methods which communism uses in order to achieve these great idealistic aims. (Interruption) It is only the idealism of communism that appeals to youth and not the means and methods which communism uses. I am reminded of a saying which used to be popular in English universities in my time that the man who is not a socialist before 21 shows that he has no heart, and a man who is a socialist after 21 shows that he has no head, and that is why, Sir, communism is so popular among students . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What happens to the man who becomes Swafentraite after forty? Probably he has neither the head nor the heart.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: And that is why, Sir, communism is so popular among students and communism wants to attract students to its fold and is able to attract them so easily.

So, the net result of all my observations is that students should, while at college or at the University, be encouraged to learn all that they can about politics and related political subjects, to store their mind with information and to discipline their mind. So that when they come out into active political life they can choose between Communism and Socialism, between Communism and the Congress, between Communism and the Swatantra Party. It is only by educating themselves, by strengthening their minds and their character while at school and college—because later in life they will never have the opportunity for such major acquisitions—that they can become good politicians later on.

The second part of the proposition with which I agree is that they should be kept out of active participation in politics, especially in view of the manner in which political movements are conducted these days, and in so doing we shall be benefiting not only the students but the political life of the country.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, I would like to make it clear at the very outset that the Resolution moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Vajpayee, is very ill-conceived. Not only it is ill-conceived but it is also outmoded. Therefore, it requires to be thrown out. This is not the time when we should consider a resolution whether the students should participate in politics or not. Certainly, every human being is a political animal. How can you prevent anybody from participating in politics? If you want to prevent anybody from participating in politics, you are only preventing him from living a full life that he is expected to live. Therefore, Sir, it is extremely ill-informed.

It is probably supposed to serve only one purpose, the purpose of gaining an advantage over the rest of the parties, of course, an advantage to the party to which Mr. Vajpayee belongs.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: What advantage?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Preventing the students from joining the political parties will give his party a great advantage in the political field as no student joins the Jan Sangh Party. Fortunately or unfortunately, it is detestable to every one of the students. Therefore, Sir, it is not in tune with the time.

Not only that, the wording of the Resolution is not precise. What does the hon. Member mean by "active politics"? He has not defined it. Does it mean, as the previous speaker was saying, taking part in elections, becoming a member of a political party

and, if necessity arises, fight 'for the common cause of the country and things like that? Of course, the wording is very vague. He has not defined it. Moreover, I could not understand his Hindi speech and from what little I could understand of his speech, he has also not defined it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The average age in Jan Sangh is 50. Mr. Vajpayee is the youngest.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: You do not know anything about Jan Sangh, my dear friend.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: And also in extending invitations to leaders of political parties, it is not every political party that he wants to be included, he wants only major political parties to be included. I cannot understand that approach of his. How can such a thing be on a rational basis because every political party, everybody is interested in the politics of the country? That would be unfair. Because he himself is not serious, there-fare, he uses the words "major political parties" of which, probably, Jan Sangh is not one. Anyway, if I am permitted to use the words of Waltair I appropriate those words for myself in this connection—I loathe what Mr. Vajpayee has said and I disagree with all that he has said on this occasion and yet I will fight to death for his right to say. That is the democracy of our conception.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Very kind of you.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: And it is for this very reason that I want all students to take active interest in politics, if necessary, participate to the extent it is necessary. Consistent with the prosecution of his studies, without prejudice to his studies, he should be allowed to take part in politics. After all, the child is the father of man. In his formative stage, in his educational career he is studying books after books, getting ideas after ideas into

his head. If the study is the theoretical portion of the job, active participation in politics is the practical job. His theoretical knowledge should be applied in the practical field. An ounce of practice is better than a ton of mere theory. Therefore, as he studies in a University, as he imbibe\* his ideas from the people, from the politicians including the Jan Sangh, if necessary, these ideas must be put into practice.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: WhM about my amendment?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Your amendment is irrelevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Having conceded the right to students to participate in politics in whatever form at whatever time, amendment to exclude communal parties in that context becomes irrelevant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Communal parties.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Even communal parties should be given chance. Because Jan Sangh was given their chance and people declared their verdict against Jan Sangh in unambiguous terms.

AN HON. MEMBER: Unequivocal terms.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Ya», in unequivocal terms—that is exactly the word that I wanted to use.

Apart from this, I would like to say that there is a certain amount of suppression of ideas in the method that Mr. Vajpayee is proposing through this Resolution. Suppression of ideas is not good. According to me, Sir, it is more harmful than good. It creates a sort of reaction. If you suppress the ideas and opinion, it goes counter to democracy. All silencing of discussion and expression of opinion is an assumption of infallibility to which Mr. Vajpayee will not be a party, I am sure, on second thoughts.

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.] Similarly, if these students are prevented from taking part in active politics, the principles and professions of all types of politics will degenerate into rituals. We have known to our cost that several things have become rituals like that. In our religion, in our practice, several things have become rituals which have degenerated the nation to a considerable extent. Instead of that if you allow them to take part in politics, it will not be a ritual, it will be a question of belief, it will be a question of faith which he will try to put into practice. A citizen must be allowed to grow to his fullest capacity under freedom, not under restraint. Therefore, I say, Sir, full chance must be given to every student for developing fully his ideas. In that context the Resolution has no place and the practice at present followed is extremely good. It shall not be prevented by resolutions of this kind. I would like to know what would have been the fate of this country if in 1921 so many students had not gone out of their schools and colleges when the call came from Mahatmaji. What would have been the fate of this country if students had not taken part in the year 1942 when the "Quit India Movement" came up?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: But this is 1962, my dear friend.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: That *Ha* all right and it is all the more necessary now that students should play their part. Now there is no more any necessity to carry on a movement like the "Quit India Movement" or the freedom struggle. But they have to play their part in developing the country on sound democratic lines and in developing our resources and the economic strength of the country. That *ia* the situation in which we are situated and we must give the students the fullest scope to play their part not only in the political field but also in the economic field and in every other field. They should equip themselves well and acquire all the necessary

knowledge and use their discretion as to which party is good and which party is not good. I would also say that the very doctrines which the various political parties profess will be in great danger of being enfeebled if they are not allowed to have their full effect on the character and conduct of the future citizens. Therefore, even in the interest of the Jan Sangh students must be given full scope to know all that they profess and practise.

Lastly I would like to ask one question. Is it in accordance with our Constitution to prevent anybody from taking part in politics? What right have you to do that? You have no right to divide them like this, as those who have developed full citizenship, those who have completed 21 years of age, and others. The hon. the Mover of the Resolution in his speech specially referred to those who had attained the age of 21. But to be a citizen of India you need not be 21 years old,

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: To be a voter you have to be 21.

SHRI N! SRI RAMA REDDY: Quite right. I wanted to point out that distinction with regard to the speech made by the previous speaker, Shri Ruthnaswamy, because he was stating that only those who were 21 years old and not others should be allowed to take part in politics. But everybody is a citizen of India.

AN HON. MEMBER: One is born a citizen of India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: E n a son born to a Swatantra-Party father will be a citizen of India.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh) : You are also a citizen of India.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I would like to point out that our party, the party to which I have the honour to belong, does not allow anybody below the age of eighteen to become a member of the party. He must be a major. Before that as we know, he is not



entitled of noia even property. are very wisely the great Congress Party has been observing this rule that anyone who wants to be a member of the party should have attained the age of eighteen, to qualify himself for membership. Therefore, it is not irresponsible people who become members of the party. I am putting forward this idea that students also can become members of political parties and there should be no bar to that. They should become members of political parties and they must know the thoughts and feelings, faiths and beliefs in this country. They are the citizens who will have to bear the brunt of the entire future of this country and if you prevent them in this way, great danger might come to this country.

In the Fundamental Rights mentioned in our Constitution we have given every citizen certain rights, like the right of expression and the right of association and so on. How can we prevent them now in this way? How can you take away by means of a resolution what has been given to them by the Constitution? I would say this is impossible and it is unconstitutional. The Resolution itself is unconstitutional and we need not consider a resolution of this type. Therefore it is that I said it is ill-conceived, ill-informed and completely out of tune with the times. That is why I say this Resolution should not be considered at all and you will pardon me if I say the valuable time of the House was wasted on this Resolution.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Now you have also added to it.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Anyway, I had to point that out and that I have done.

**श्री विमलकुमार मल्लालजी चौरङ्गिया**  
(मछा प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री भूपेश गुप्ता के और कुछ मित्रों के भाषण को सुन कर ऐसा प्रतीत हुआ कि इस प्रस्ताव के पारित हो जाने के पश्चात् उनके मन में विद्यार्थियों के द्वारा अपने दल की

शक्ति बढ़ाने की जो भावना है उसको बहुत बड़ा धक्का लगेगा और इतने जोरदार धक्कों में उन्होंने इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध किया जैसे कि मानों इसके पारित हो जाने पर उनका अस्तित्व ही भारत देश से उठ जायेगा। ऐसी उनके मन में भावना काम कर रही है। यह उनके भाषण से प्रतीत हुआ।

जो यह प्रस्ताव माननीय अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने प्रस्तुत किया है मैं उसका हार्दिक समर्थन करता हूँ और जो संशोधन श्री भूपेश गुप्ता जी ने दिये उनका मैं विरोध करता हूँ। इसका प्रमुख कारण यह है कि जो प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया गया है, उसमें मांग की गई है कि हमारे देश की जो प्रमुख राजनीतिक पार्टियाँ हों वे सब एकत्रित हों और इकट्ठा हो कर यह निर्णय लें कि जो हमारे देश का निर्माण करने के लिये अभी विद्यार्थी रूप में हैं उनको सक्रिय राजनीति में न घसीटा जाये, जब तक उनके दिमाग पूरी तरह से परिपक्व न हो जाये, जब तक वे अपना अध्ययन पूरा न कर लें तब तक उनको राजनीति में घसीटा न जाये। किन्तु अपने व्यक्तिगत स्वार्थ के पीछे, अपने दल के स्वार्थ के पीछे या अपने क्षेत्र के स्वार्थ के पीछे हम उन विद्यार्थियों को जबर्दस्ती राजनीति में घसीट कर के लाते हैं और इस बात की चिन्ता नहीं करते कि उन विद्यार्थियों के भविष्य का क्या होगा, उन विद्यार्थियों की पढ़ाई लिखाई का क्या होगा, उनके भविष्य में कितना अवकाश छा सकता है और उससे देश का कितना लाभ या हानि हो सकती है। इन सब बातों की कल्पना किए बिना हम उनके मन में राजनीति के बीजों पर ऐसी मनोवृत्ति पैदा करते हैं जो भविष्य में जा कर नुस्खाने देह हो सकती है और इसी लिहाज से यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि हमारे विद्यार्थियों के अन्दर राजनीतिक भावनाओं का जो भी विकास हो वह स्वच्छ रीति से अध्ययन के आचार पर और स्वतंत्रता पूर्वक हो। यह नहीं हो कि जयसंघ दल के लोग उनके बीच चले जायें और उनको अपनी पार्टी

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया]  
 वसीटने का प्रयास करें, कम्युनिस्ट लोग चले जायें और अपने दल में खींचने का प्रयास करें बल्कि ऐसा न कर के उन के मस्तिष्क को स्वच्छंद विकास के साथ बढ़ने देना चाहिये, उसमें राजनैतिक प्रचार की आवश्यकता नहीं होनी चाहिये, उसके लिये उनको राजनीति में वसीटने की जरूरत नहीं।

वैसे देखा जाये तो विद्यार्थियों की शक्ति बहुत बड़ी है और जब यह शक्ति संगठित हो कर, तूफान के रूप में चलती है तो उसके सामने जितनी भी शक्तियाँ आती हैं एक बार तो उनको झुकना ही पड़ता है। जब सन् १९४२ का आन्दोलन चला था उस समय शक्ति की परीक्षा की गई थी और उस समय दो प्रश्न सामने थे। एक तरफ था देश की आजादी का संवाल और दूसरी तरफ था, हमारे विद्यार्थियों के भविष्य का क्या होगा, क्या नहीं? इन सब में महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न देश की स्वतंत्रता का था जो कि इतने वर्षों से दासता की बेड़ी में जकड़ा हुआ था। और उस समय वहीं किया गया जो देश के लिये आवश्यक था। किन्तु अब स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद, अपने व्यक्तिगत राजनैतिक स्वार्थ के लिये, अपने दल के लाभ के लिये जिनके पास सत्ता नहीं है वह चाहते हैं कि हम किसी न किसी तरह सत्ता प्राप्त कर लें और जिनके पास सत्ता है वे चाहते हैं वह सत्ता हमारे साथ चिपकी रहे और इस लालच से वे विद्यार्थी दल को वसीटना चाहते हैं लेकिन यह हमारे लिये कभी भी उचित नहीं हो सकता। दूसरे लोगों के कार्य को देख कर हमारे मन में आता है कि हम भी इस शक्ति का उपयोग अपने दल के लाभ के लिये लें किन्तु हमारे दल के निर्देशों के अनुसार हमको हिचकिचाना पड़ता है। एक तरफ अपने दल का स्वार्थ या व्यक्तिगत स्वार्थ और दूसरी तरफ सारे देश के हित की बात, विद्यार्थियों के भविष्य की बात, इन सारी बातों को देख कर हमारी

भावना, हमारी इच्छा उनको अपनी तरफ खींचने की होते हुए भी, हम नहीं चाहते कि उनका भविष्य किसी तरह बिगड़ जाये।

SHRI M. M. S. SIDDHU: What about Hindi Parishads in the Universities?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया: उसका क्या कांस्टिट्यूशन है क्या नहीं है, यह जब तक देखू नहीं तब तक कुछ कह नहीं सकता। परन्तु अगर हिन्दी परिषद् का काम भी राजनैतिक कार्य से संबंधित है तो मैं उसका विरोध करता हूँ, मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिये नहीं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं किसी भी तरह की जो राजनैतिक भावना आज विद्यार्थियों के मन में पैदा की जाती है और उनको अपने दल में वसीटने का प्रयास किया जाता है, उसके विरुद्ध हूँ। जैसा कि कुछ मित्रों ने मत प्रगट किया कि विद्यार्थियों के ऊपर राजनीति में भाग लेने में इस तरह से बांधन लगाने से उनके विकास में, उनके अध्ययन में बाधा पड़ेगी लेकिन प्रस्ताव में कहीं भी यह नहीं रखा है। इसमें स्पष्ट लिखा है कि उनको "एक्टिव पोलिटिक्स" से अलग रखा जाय। वे स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक विचार कर सकते हैं, चाहे यहाँ की राजनीति का अध्ययन करे चाहे विदेशों की राजनीति का अध्ययन करें, कहीं का भी करें, किन्तु वे किसी "वाद" से बंध कर एक्टिव पोलिटिक्स में न कूदे, वे किसी दल विशेष के भक्त नहीं बने रहें, देश के भक्त बने रहें जब तक कि वे विद्यार्थी जीवन में रहें और जब उनका दिमाग परिपक्व हो जाय और विद्यार्थी जीवन को छोड़ दें, तब चाहे वे किसी दल के भक्त बन जायें उसमें हमें किसी तरह की आपत्ति नहीं हो सकती।

जिन्होंने इस तरह का भय प्रकट किया है, मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस तरह का भय प्रकट करने से पहले वे

हमारे प्रस्तावक महोदय के भाषण की अच्छी तरह से सुन लें तो इस तरह के भय प्रकट करने की आवश्यकता नहीं होती। अगर वे अपने दिमाग के दरवाजे को बंद न करते और खुलकर विचार करते तो इस तरह के भय प्रकट करने की आवश्यकता नहीं होती। हमारे प्रस्तावक महोदय ने यह कभी नहीं कहा कि विद्यार्थियों को राजनीतिक विषयक विचार करने से रोका जाय। उन्होंने कहा है कि विद्यार्थियों को काफी विचार करने दिया जाय और इस पर किसी तरह का प्रतिबन्ध नहीं लगाया जाना चाहिये।

जैसा कि माननीय श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने अपने भाषण में बतलाया कि जनसंघ के साथ विद्यार्थी आना नहीं चाहते हैं। मैं उनकी इस तरह की भावना को एकदम अस्वीकृत करता हूँ। मैं उनसे निवेदन करूँगा कि उन्हें हमारे त्याग को कमजोरी की निशानी नहीं समझना चाहिये और त्याग के प्रति आँख नहीं मूंद लेना चाहिये। हमारी जो त्याग की भावना है उसको त्याग की ही भावना समझा जाना चाहिये। हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि हमारे विद्यार्थी राजनीति में प्रवेश करें और अपना भविष्य बिगाड़ लें और साथ ही साथ देश के लिए खतरा पैदा करें। मैं उनसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी इस त्याग की भावना की वे उपेक्षा न करें। हम जानबूझकर नहीं चाहते हैं कि विद्यार्थी राजनीति में फँसें। अगर विद्यार्थी राजनीति के पचड़े में फँस जायेंगे तो बुरा होगा। उनकी बुद्धि पूरी तरह से परिपक्व नहीं होती है। जिस प्रकार हम गीली मिट्टी को पिस तरह का स्वरूप चाहें दे सकते हैं उसी तरह से हमारे विद्यार्थियों का भी हाल हो जायेगा, अगर उन्हें राजनीति में हिस्सा लेने दिया। हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाई तो यह चाहते हैं कि विद्यार्थी राजनीति में हिस्सा लें और इस तरह से वे अपना पंजा उनके ऊपर

ढाल दें और धीरे-धीरे सारे देश को लाल पंजों में जकड़ लें। जब वे अपने इस ध्येय में सफल हो जायेंगे, सारे देश को लाल पंजे से जकड़ लेंगे, सारे देश में लाल साम्राज्य फैल जायेगा, तो वे फिर विद्यार्थियों को ही नहीं किसी भी नागरिक को राजनीति की बात भी नहीं करने देंगे। इस हिसाब से मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करूँगा कि जो उनका इस तरह का स्वप्न है, वह उस स्वप्न को जरा समाप्त कर लें। हमारे देश में दलभक्तों की आवश्यकता नहीं है बल्कि देशभक्तों की आवश्यकता है। इसलिए मैं प्रार्थना करूँगा कि श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, उसको सब लोग स्वीकार कर लें और उसकी भावना के अनुरूप कार्य करें।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं श्री वाजपेयी जी के प्रस्ताव का सख्त विरोध करता हूँ। सन् १९२० से लेकर अब तक छात्रों ने आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी और उसके बाद हमने स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्त की। स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्त करने के बाद जब से हम समाजवादी रास्ते पर जा रहे हैं तब से हमारे नेताओं में आपस में इस बात पर मतभेद रहा है कि छात्र तथा छात्राओं को राजनीति में भाग लेना चाहिये या नहीं? लेकिन जब जब देश में आजादी प्राप्त करने के लिए या किसी और काम के लिए जनता की आवश्यकता हुई तो हमारे छात्र और छात्राओं ने इसमें सक्रिय भाग लिया। हमारे छात्र और छात्राओं ने देश की आजादी में बड़ी तादाद में भाग लिया और खासकर जो हमारा सन् १९४२ के अग्रस्त महीने का आन्दोलन था, वह हमारे छात्र और छात्राओं का ही आन्दोलन था और वह हमारे देश में "अग्रस्त क्रान्ति" के नाम से मशहूर हो गया है। उस समय हमारे देश के जितने भी महान नेता थे वे सब जेल में बंद थे

[ श्री शीलभद्र याजी ]

और छात्र तथा छात्राओं ने ही देश की आजादी में भाग लेकर देश को आजाद कराया। अब श्री वाजपेयी जी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है उसमें उन्होंने यह कहा कि विद्यार्थियों को राजनीति में भाग नहीं लेना चाहिये। तो मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस सक्रिय राजनीति का क्या मतलब है। अब हमारे देश में राजनीति के कार्य क्या रह गये हैं? देश में जितनी भी राजनीतिक पार्टियाँ हैं उनका अपना अपना विधान है और सबके विधान में यह दिया हुआ है कि इतने उम्रवाले उसके सदस्य बन सकते हैं। जहाँ तक पार्लियामेंट का सवाल है, असेम्बली का सवाल है, कौंसिल का सवाल है, राज्य सभा का सवाल है, इन सब के लिए उम्र निखी हुई है २५ से ३० साल तक। इस तरह से हर पार्टी में विद्यार्थियों को शरीक होने के लिए उम्र का केंद्र रखी हुई है। जो हमारी पार्टी है, शासक पार्टी है, उसके विधान में भी इस तरह की उम्र विद्यार्थियों के लिए रखी हुई है। हमारे देश में कांग्रेस पार्टी के अलावा कांग्रेस भूपेश गुप्त की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी है और उसी तरह से ब्रज सोशलिस्ट पार्टी आदि हैं। इन सभी पार्टियों का और हमारी शासक पार्टी का जो कि वर्गनिष्ठ है एक ही ध्येय है और सब एक स्वर से कह रहे हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो व्यवस्था होगी वह समाजवादी समाज की व्यवस्था होगी। लेकिन उसके साथ ही साथ जो हमारे नेता हैं वे भी यह कहते हैं कि इस समय हमारे देश में जो छात्र तथा छात्राएँ हैं, वे हमारे देश के भावी नेता हैं। अगर हम इन भावी नेताओं को समाजवाद के रास्ते से दूर रखेंगे तो वे सिम्बल आऊ रिबोल्ट बन सकते हैं, वे वागो हो सकते हैं। यदि हमने उनका दिमाग सक्रिय राजनीति से अलग कर दिया तो वे भाषावाद के आन्दोलन में फँस जायेंगे। अगर हमने उनको अकेला छोड़ दिया तो वे साम्प्र-

दायिक संस्थाओं के फेर में आ जायेंगे। अब राजनीतिक पार्टियाँ छात्रों में सक्रिय राजनीतिक नहीं रहीं। आर० एस० एस० एस० का काम तो छात्रों में कवायद के रूप में चलता ही रहेगा। और अब सारी राजनीतिक पार्टियाँ छात्रों से अलग रहेंगी। कांग्रेस भूपेश गुप्त की पार्टी को अन्दर-आउन्ड विचारधारा चलेगी ही। अगर हम इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार कर लेते हैं तो हम छात्र तथा छात्राओं के बीच में जाने से वंचित हो जाते हैं।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, for his information I might tell him that the Communists are today in the Outer Space. They are not underground.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मैं काम के बारे में कह रहा हूँ। वह पार्टी पहले अन्दर-आउन्ड पार्टी थी और अब अब-आउन्ड हो गई है। इसलिए मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि जिस समाजवादी व्यवस्था को हमारी सरकार चलाता चाहती है, राजनीतिक पार्टियाँ चलाना चाहती हैं, उस समाजवादी व्यवस्था को ठीक ढंग से चलाने के लिए, संचालन करने के लिए जो हमारे भावी नेता हैं, जो छात्र तथा छात्राएँ हैं, यदि उनमें समाजवाद की भावना नहीं भरी जायेगी तो वे साम्प्रदायिक बन सकते हैं। देश में जब भी कोई आन्दोलन होगा वे उसमें चले जायेंगे। जब उन्होंने आजादी की लड़ाई में इस तरह से सक्रिय भाग लिया और देश को आजाद कराया तो आजादी की प्राप्ति के बाद जो हमारे देश में समाजवाद की लड़ाई चल रही है, उसमें भी उन्हें भाग लेने का हक है। इसलिए सभी राजनीतिक पार्टियाँ, कम से कम जो प्रगतिशील हैं, वे यदि छात्र तथा छात्राओं के बीच में रहती हैं, उनका उचित पथ-प्रदर्शन करती हैं, तो ये लोग जो हमारे भावी नेता हैं, उनका दिमाग कभी भी खराब नहीं हो सकता है। अभी कुछ लोगों

ने कहा कि अगर छात्र तथा छात्राएं राजनीति में भाग लेंगे तो उनकी पढ़ाई खराब हो जायेगी। मैं जब छात्र था तो कांग्रेस की ज़िन्दगी में चार बार जेल गया और हमारे कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त ने जेल से ही परीक्षा दी और बी० ए० पास किया। हमारी जेल जाने पर पढ़ाई खराब नहीं हुई। और मैं बराबर अपने वर्ग में फर्स्ट हो जाता था। मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है कि जो लड़का होशियार होगा वह कहीं भी जाकर पढ़ सकता है। जो होशियार नहीं होगा वह चाहे कितना ही पढ़े फिर भी कामयाब नहीं हो सकता है।

अभी तो हमारे देश में निर्माण का काम शुरू हुआ है। हमने अपने देश में समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना करने के लिये लड़ाई शुरू कर दी है और इसके लिये हमारे देश में योजनाएं चलाई जा रही हैं। हमारे देश में जो प्लानिंग का काम चल रहा है उसमें छात्र तथा छात्राओं को किस तरह से भाग लेना चाहिये यह हमारा काम होना चाहिये। उन्हें कॉलेज में छाड़ी होने पर गांवों में जाकर गांव वालों को बताना चाहिये कि हमारे देश में तुम्हारे गांव में, किस तरह से सरकार डेवलपमेंट का काम कर रहा है और किस तरह से तुम्हें उसमें सक्रिय भाग लेना चाहिये। इस तरह से हमारे छात्र तथा छात्राओं का यह काम हो जाता है कि वे देश के किसानों और मजदूरों को बतलायें कि देश में जितनी योजनाएँ चल रही हैं उन्हें तुम्हें सफलतापूर्वक करना है जिससे देश में समाजवाद की स्थापना होगी। इसलिये हमारे देश में समाजवाद का काम चल रहा है, उसकी स्थापना के लिये यत्न चल रहा है, अगर उसमें हमारे छात्र तथा छात्राएं सक्रिय भाग नहीं लेते तो हम देश में जल्दी से समाजवाद की स्थापना नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसका एक नतीजा यह भी होगा कि अगर हमारे छात्र तथा छात्राओं ने देश में समाजवादी व्यवस्था स्थापित करने की

लड़ाई में भाग नहीं लिया तो उनमें राजनीतिक चेतना नहीं आयेगी और वे भाषावाद तथा साम्प्रदायिक झड़ोलनों में फँस जायेंगे, देश के विभाजन के समय जिस तरह से मुस्लिम छात्र साम्प्रदायिक भावना में बह गये थे और उन्होंने मिस्टर जिना की लीडरशिप को कबूल किया, जिसका नतीजा भारत का विभाजन हुआ। इसलिये यदि इन साम्प्रदायिक तत्वों से, वे जो विद्रोहकारी मनोवृत्तियाँ हैं उनसे और जो अपने को देशभक्त कहते हैं मगर देश के लिये गढ़ारी करने के लिये तैयार हैं उनसे विद्यार्थियों को सावधान रखना है तो यह आवश्यक है कि हम छात्रों के बीच में जाकर उनका उचित मार्गदर्शन करें। जो पोलिटिकल पार्टिज के लोग हैं, जो सियासी पार्टिज के लोग हैं वे तो स्वयं विद्यार्थियों में जा नहीं सकते। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का जैसे स्टूडेंट्स फेडरेशन है, कांग्रेस की यूथ कांग्रेस है और प्रजासमाजवाद की समाजवादी युवक सभा है, ऐसी ही सब राजनैतिक पार्टियों की छात्रों में संस्थाएँ हैं जो स्कूल, कॉलेज और विश्वविद्यालय में काम करती हैं।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Students Federation is not an organisation of the Communist Party, I can assure you.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : माननीय वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, यह बात सही नहीं है। स्टूडेंट्स फेडरेशन सिर्फ कम्युनिस्टों की संस्था है और यदि कामरेड भूपेश गुप्त कहते हैं कि ऐसा नहीं है तो मैं इसको मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। हम सब लोग यह जानते हैं कि स्टूडेंट्स फेडरेशन कम्युनिस्ट की संस्था है। मैं उसकी हिस्ट्री में जाना नहीं चाहता। लेकिन यह सत्य है कि जो स्टूडेंट्स फेडरेशन है वह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से संबंधित है और उसी से उसको नेतृत्व मिलता है, और यह सब लोग अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं।

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

मैं यह कह रहा था कि सभी काफ़ेजों तथा विश्वविद्यालयों में विद्यार्थियों की यूनियनें हैं। अब अगर उन यूनियनों में राजनैतिक तथा समाजवादी ख्याल के लोग नहीं रहते हैं तो उनमें एक वैकुण्ठ हो जायेगा और उसका परिणाम यह होगा कि साम्प्रदायिक एलिमेंट उनमें घुस जायेगा। इसलिये स्वस्थ राजनीति चलाने के ख्याल से मैं वाजपेयी जी से अपील करूंगा कि वे राजनैतिक पार्टियों को छात्र छात्राओं से अलग रखने का प्रयत्न न करें। मैं वाजपेयी जी की देशभक्ति में सन्देह नहीं करता हूँ। लेकिन उनको इस बात पर विचार करना चाहिये कि आज देश की परिस्थिति क्या है। आज देश में बहुत सी विनाशकारी प्रवृत्तियाँ चल रही हैं। अकालियों का आंदोलन चल रहा है। नागालैंड में भारत से हटने का आंदोलन चल रहा है। द्रविड़ मुन्नेत्र कळगम के जो प्रतिनिधि, यहां पर बैठे हुये थे उनका भी भारत से अलग हो जाने का आंदोलन चल रहा है। इन चीजों के संबंध में कौन विद्यार्थियों को समझायेगा? इस प्रकार यदि उनको अक्का नेतृत्व नहीं मिला तो वे गलत रास्ते पर चले जायेंगे। उनके गलत रास्ते पर जाने के कारण ही देश का विभाजन हुआ और आसाम आदि स्थान पर जो भाषावाद का आंदोलन हुआ उसमें भी छात्र ही अग्रगण्य थे। यदि छात्र को अच्छा नेतृत्व नहीं मिलता है और उनको समाजवाद अच्छी तरह से समझाया नहीं जाता है तो आगे भी वे विनाशकारी कार्य करते रहेंगे। हमने समाजवाद की घोषणा की है, लेकिन आज जो हमारे इंजीनियर, लेजिस्लेटर, आफिसर आदि विद्यार्थियों में से निकलने वाले हैं, वे अच्छी तरह से यह नहीं जानते हैं कि "व्हाट इज सोशलिज्म" और जो हमारा समाजवाद चल रहा है, हमारी प्लानिंग चल रही है, उस पर वे अमल नहीं कर सकते। इसलिये भी यह बहुत जरूरी है कि जो हमारे आफिसर कैडर के लोग तैयार हों, या जो ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटर तैयार हों या लेजिस्लेटर तैयार हों, वे इन

सब चीजों को अच्छी तरह से समझें और व तब इन चीजों को अच्छी तरह से समझ सकते हैं जब राजनैतिक दल या उनकी संस्थाएं उनके बीच काम करती हों। हमने देखा कि बिहार में पहले विद्यार्थी साम्प्रदायिक बन रहे थे, धार० एस० एस० एस० की ओर जा रहे थे और कुछ कम्युनिस्ट माइंडेड भी थे। लेकिन जो गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की नीति है समाजवादी पालिसी है, उसके संबंध में जब उनको ठीक तरह से समझाया गया तो मैंने एक वर्ष में ७५ हजार विद्यार्थी यूथ कांग्रेस के सदस्य बनाये। और वे काफी सजग हो गये और पोलिटिकली कांशस हो गये। इसलिये मैं वाजपेयी जी से अपील करूंगा कि यदि वे हिन्दुस्तान में स्वस्थ राजनीति चलाना चाहते हैं, यदि वे जल्दी से जल्दी समाजवाद की स्थापना करना चाहते हैं, यदि वे अच्छे कैडर के आफिसर तैयार करना चाहते हैं, यदि वे देश में जो विनाशकारी प्रवृत्तियाँ चल रही हैं उनसे छात्र छात्राओं को सावधान करना चाहते हैं और उनमें देशभक्ति की भावना पैदा करना चाहते हैं, तो वे अपने प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लें। जब हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई चल रही थी, उसके मुकाबले में आज हमको छात्र छात्राओं की ओर अधिक ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। आज हमारे देश में जो विनाशकारी प्रवृत्तियाँ काम कर रही हैं, आज हमारे देश को जिस तरह से दुश्मन घेरे हुए हैं, इन सब बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए और हमारे देश में जो प्लानिंग चल रही है उसको ठीक तरह से आगे बढ़ाने के लिये, यह बहुत जरूरी है कि हम छात्र छात्राओं को सब बातें ठीक तरह से समझाएँ। इसके अतिरिक्त प्रस्तावक महोदय ने उम्र की कैद की बात कही, किन्तु प्रस्ताव में यह नहीं लिखा हुआ है कि विद्यार्थी १८ या २० वर्ष की आयु के बाद राजनीति में भाग ले सकते हैं। तो प्रस्ताव से यह बात साफ नहीं होती है। इसके साथ साथ जितनी उम्र के लड़के पढ़ते हैं, वह उम्र ऐसी नहीं होती है जिस में वे सक्रिय राजनीति में भाग ले कर के

असेम्बली या पार्लियामेंट में आ सकते हैं तो वैसा कोई खतरा भी उनसे नहीं है जैसा कि देश के कुछ नेता लोग नवयुवकों के राजनीति में आ जाने में समझते हैं। इसलिए स्वस्थ राजनीति चलाने के लिए और देश में जो विनाशकारी प्रवृत्तियाँ कभी कभी भड़कती रहती हैं उनसे विद्यार्थियों को बचाने के लिए मैं वाजपेयी जी से अपील करूंगा कि वे अपने प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लें। मैं नहीं जानता कि गवर्नमेंट का इस सम्बन्ध में क्या विचार है। किन्तु जो मैंने उचित समझा वह मैंने सदन के सामने स्पष्ट कर दिया। आज स्थिति यह है कि शिक्षा संस्थाओं में कोई स्टूडेंट्स आर्गनाइजेशन या यूथ आर्गनाइजेशन न रहने के बाद मैंने देखा है कि वहाँ जो छात्र युनियनों के इलेक्शन होते हैं उनमें जातिवाद और साम्प्रदायिकता का बोल वाला होता है क्योंकि अखाड़ा खाली होता है। तो इस प्रस्ताव से बहुत नुकसान होने वाला है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं वाजपेयी जी से फिर अपील करूंगा कि वे इस प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लें क्योंकि इस समय देश में बहुत से खतरे हैं और देश के टुकड़े टुकड़े करने की प्रवृत्ति कुछ लोगों में मौजूद है। और उससे विद्यार्थियों को सावधान रखना जरूरी है। इसलिए मैं इस प्रस्ताव का सख्त विरोध करता हूँ।

4 P.M.

श्री नीरेन घोष : वाइस-चेयरमैन साहब, मैं इस प्रस्ताव का, जो कि सदन के सामने श्री वाजपेयी ने रखा है, सख्त विरोध करता हूँ क्योंकि यह प्रस्ताव देश को प्रतिक्रिया की ओर ले जाने वाला है और गणतंत्र को पंगु करने के लिये इस प्रस्ताव को रखा गया है।

अब, दोस्तों! कि हमारा देश का हालत क्या है? हमारे जितने केन्द्रीय कर्मचारी हैं, सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं—मान लीजिये कि उनकी संख्या २२ लाख है तो उनके परिवार वालों को भी लें तो उनकी गिनती कम से कम १ करोड़ होगी—उनके लिये तो राजनीति में में हिस्सा लेने पर पाबन्दी लगा दी गई है और उन्हें राजनीति से अलग रखा गया है। उनको संविधान के अंदर जो बुनियादी हक दिया गया है वह हक किसी और तरीके से छीन लिया गया है। जितनी राज्य सरकारें हैं उनमें जितने सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं और उनके जो परिवार वाले हैं उन सबकी गिनती की जायेंगी तो आप देखियेगा कि वे कमसे कम चार या पांच करोड़ के होंगे और इसके बाद जो लोग नौकरी पाने की उम्मीद में हैं उन तमाम को लेकर गिनती कीजियेगा तो आप देखियेगा कि सब पांच या सात करोड़ से कम नहीं है, तो ४४ करोड़ की आवादी के अन्दर पांच या सात करोड़ को राजनीति से किसी न किसी तरीके से अलग कर दिया है, यानी गणतंत्र का जो बुनियादी हक है उस हक को उनसे छीना गया है। तो यहां तक गणतंत्र को पंगु किया गया है और इसके बाद फिर भी श्रीवाजपेयी जी और एक पाबन्दी लगाना चाहते हैं।

श्री वाजपेयी ने कहा कि हमको प्राचीन परम्पराओं की रक्षा करना है और यह कहा राजा बदले, सब कुछ बदला लेकिन समाज उसी तरह रहता रहा है। मुझे तो ताज्जुब है कि उन्हें यह भी नहीं मालूम है, राजा थे, लेकिन पांच सौ साल पहले। पूँजीपति लोग नहीं थे, उद्योग-धंधे नहीं थे, कारखाने नहीं थे, मजदूर-श्रेणी नहीं थी, धमीर थे, गरीब थे—यह सही बात है—लेकिन कैपिटलिज्म नहीं था, पूँजीपतियों का जो दस्तूर है



[श्री निरेन घोष]

वह नहीं पैदा हुआ था, यह तो फिलहाल पैदा हुआ है। तो समाज बदल गया है और वह बदलेगा, यह कानून है, यह नियम है, वाजपेयी जी या जनसंघ चाहें या न चाहें वह तो बदल कर रहेगा और बदलेगा, कितनी भी वह कोशिश करें वह रुक नहीं सकेगा। तो तब आप प्राचीन परम्परा की बात कहते हैं तब यह भी देखियेगा कि आज दो किस्म की धाराएँ हैं, एक तो प्रतिक्रिया की ओर है और दूसरी प्रगति की ओर है। अब, जो प्रगति की धाराएँ हैं इसको आगे बढ़ाना है लेकिन इसी पर श्री वाजपेयी और जनसंघ पार्टी रोकथाम लगाना चाहती है। सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं, आप यह भी देखिये कि हमारे देश के लिये कौन रास्ता ठीक है। नेहरू जी भी बोलते हैं कि आजादी प्राप्त होने के बाद देश के सामने देश के निर्माण का सबसे बड़ा सवाल है और इससे हम सहमत हैं लेकिन सवाल यह है कि वह कौन से रास्ते पर हो। सवाल यह है कि कौन से रास्ते पर चलने से देश की प्रगति हो सकती है और देश आगे बढ़ सकता है और देश का निर्माण किया जा सकता है तो सवाल इसी बात पर है। आज देश के अन्दर, दुनिया के अन्दर, दो रास्तों की टक्कर चल रही है। एक इजारादारी का रास्ता है, पूंजीपतियों का रास्ता है, ऊँचे ऊँचे महुलों का है और इस रास्ते पर जो लोग हैं, उनको और तमाम देश को ढोना चाहते हैं और अपने मन के ढाँचे के मुताबिक इसका निर्माण करना चाहते हैं। दूसरी ओर बाकी ६५ फी सेंकड़ा जनता है जो कि अपने भाग्य को अपने हाथ में लेना चाहती है और अपने देश का निर्माण करना चाहती है। तो टक्कर इन्हीं में है और इस टक्कर में यह लाजमी है, आवश्यक है कि देश की सारी की सारी जनता, हर किस्म और हर तबके के लोग, इसमें भाग

लें, हिस्सा लें, समझें बूझें और आगे बढ़ें। जब तक यह नहीं होगा तब तक देश आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता है। हमारा जो आजादी का आन्दोलन है उसकी साम्राज्य-विरोधी परम्परा है और उसी परम्परा को हमें आगे ले जाना है, साम्राज्यवाद से नाता तोड़ना है और सही दिशा में देश का निर्माण करना है। तो यह आवश्यक है कि हमारे नीजवानों का दिल व दिमाग साफ होना चाहिये। वह जो ज्ञान एकपाय करेगा वह किस लिये करेगा? देश को जानने के लिये करेगा। अगर वह नहीं जानता है कि देश को किस रास्ते पर जाना है तो फिर ज्ञान की क्या कीमत है। ज्ञान बहुत किस्म का है और पंडित भी बहुत किस्म के हैं। एक पंडित जो कि घर में बैठ करके प्रतिक्रिया के लिये बातें लिखें, और किताबें लिखे वह भी पंडित है और यह भी पंडित है जो कि यह बताये कि समाज को, देश को आगे बढ़ाने का यह रास्ता है। तो उन्हें इसका ज्ञान अर्जन करना है कि लाज और कानून को बना करके सारे देश को, सारी जनता को एकत्रित करके, देश को आगे की ओर कैसे ले जा सकते हैं। तो सवाल यह है।

अभी जनसंघ के एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है कि दलभक्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये देशभक्ति होनी चाहिये। तो उनकी बात से मुझे मालूम पड़ता है कि उनके दल की जो भावना है वह देशभक्ति की भावना से अलग है। दलभक्ति और देशभक्ति अलग अलग होंगी या ये दोनों चीजें अलग अलग होंगी, यह मैं समझ नहीं सका। अगर ऐसा है तो फिर उस दल को ही उठा देना चाहिये, यही बेहतर है। सभी पार्टीज जो हैं वह यह बात कहती हैं कि उनकी जो भावना है, उनकी जो विचारधारा है, उनका जो रास्ता है वह तमाम देश के लिये है, वह किसी दल के लिये, किसी पार्टी के लिये नहीं है। अगर तमाम सिवासी



पाठियों का यही कानून है तो फिर उनको इसमें डर क्या है, यह मानूस नहीं पड़ता है। किसी पार्टी को डर इतलिये हो सकता है कि वह जानती है कि हमारे जो नौजवान हैं, हमारे जो विद्यार्थी हैं जिनके हाथ में हमारे देश का भविष्य है वे आज नाराज हैं, जिस स्थिति में आज देश चल रहा है उससे वे संतुष्ट नहीं हैं और वे चाहते हैं कि जल्दी से जल्दी हमारा देश आगे बढ़े और सबसे आगे बढ़े हुए देश के साथ उसका मुकाबिला हो और उसका मान हो। तो जो नौजवान ऐसा रास्ता ढूँढ़ रहे हैं, खोज रहे हैं, उनसे जिन्हें डर लगता है वही कहेंगे कि विद्यार्थियों को राजनीति से अलग करके रखा जाये और इसीलिये यह प्रस्ताव रखा गया है।

मुझे ऐसा पता मिला है कि एक ऐसा मरकुर रखा गया है कि जब तक सरकारी देखभाल न हो, जब तक सरकार की स्कूलिनी न हो, तब तक विदेशों से, जितनी यूनिवर्सिटीज वगैरह हैं, वहां से कोई पुस्तक या किताब वगैरह न आये। क्या मतलब है? क्या यह मतलब है कि ऐसी कोई किताब या ऐसी पुस्तक न आये जो कि सरकार की निगाह से समझी जाये कि उचित नहीं है। इसका मतलब क्या है? सरकार जो पालिसी चलाती है तो क्या वह चाहती है कि तमाम यूनिवर्सिटीज वगैरह भी उसी पालिसी के ऊपर चलें और उससे अलग कोई चीज, उससे विरोधी वाग्धारा की कोई चीज न आने पाये। यह ठीक है कि आज कांग्रेस पार्टी सरकार चला रही है, लेकिन यह हो सकता है कि बाद में कोई दूसरी पार्टी सरकार चलाये और यह तो हो कर ही रहेगा, चाहे कांग्रेस इसको चाहे या न चाहे, आज से ५ साल बाद, १० साल बाद यह होगा, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है, हमारी पार्टी एक न एक दोज इसको हाथ में ले कर दिखायेगी,

दुनिया उसी ओर चल रही है और हिन्दुस्तान इससे बचा नहीं रहेगा, यह तो मानी हुई बात है और हम जानते हैं कि कांग्रेस के लीडर लोग . . .

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : समाजवाद के रास्ते पर कांग्रेस जा रही है।

श्री नीरेन घोष : कैसे जा रही है ?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : कांग्रेस भी समाजवाद के रास्ते पर गई है, और वह आपकी पार्टी से बहुत आगे जा रही है।

श्री नीरेन घोष : गई है तो ठीक है, जा रही है तो सही है लेकिन अब तक नहीं आई है बहुत-सी बातों में . . .

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आपके रास्ते पर हिन्दुस्तान नहीं आयेगा। तथा आपकी पार्टी की सरकार भारत में कभी भी नहीं बनेगी, कांग्रेस ही शासन चलायेगी।

श्री नीरेन घोष : देखा जायेगा, इतिहास उसको तय करेगा। तो मैं यह चाहता था कि गणतंत्र का विकास हो और उस पर कोई रोकथाम न हो।

अब संविधान तैयार किया गया उस समय बहुत-से लोगों ने, कई लोगों ने ऐसी भी आवाज उठाई थी कि हमारे देश के आदमी, हमारी पब्लिक अशिक्षित है, उनका अपरिपक्व मस्तिष्क है इसलिये तमाम लोगों को, तमाम एडल्ट्स को, फ्रैंचाइज का अधिकार नहीं मिलना चाहिये। तमाम बालिश लोगों को वोट का अधिकार नहीं मिलना चाहिये। उसी किस्म का आरगुमेंट, उसी किस्म की विचारधारा श्री वाजपेयी से आती है। मान लीजिये कि

## [श्री नीरेन घोष]

उनकी बात मानी जाती है तो फिर यह कहा जायेगा कि जो किसान लोग हैं, जो भ्रष्ट हैं वह तो और भी दबे हुए हैं, वे कैसे अपना विचार प्रकट करेंगे, उनके दिमाग नहीं हैं, वह समझते नहीं हैं, इसलिये प्रेजेन्ट जमाने की तरह सिर्फ १० परसेंट लोग वोटिंग राइट को एम्प्लोय करे। तो इस किस्म का जो खयाल है यह प्रतिक्रियावादी खयाल है और इस तरह देश की प्रगति के रास्ते पर रोड़ा लगाने की कोशिश की जाती है। जैसा कि हमारे भूतेश गुप्ता जी ने बताया कि आज हिन्दुस्तान की पब्लिक समझती है कि साम्प्रदायिक भावना की चर्चा से देश का विभाजन हुआ है, पाटोशन हुआ है और इसकी चर्चा बहुत नुकसानदेह हो रही है। प्राविशियलिज्म, कास्टिज्म, इन सब बातों का नेहरू जी जिक्र करने हैं हालांकि कांग्रेस के घन्दर भी यह बात चलती है लेकिन कम से कम पब्लिक के सामने तो इस बात को रखते हैं। तो ये सब खयालात हैं और लोगों की आंखें खुल रही हैं और जनता सब कुछ समझ रही है। इसलिये यह आवश्यक है कि आने वाले वक्त में देश की और शासन की बागडोर जिन लोगों के हाथों में रहेगी वे लोग शुरू से ही अपनी आंखों से देख लें, अपने तजुबों से सोच लें और अपने ज्ञान से जान लें, समझ लें, बूझ लें कि क्या हो रहा है। वे सक्रिय राजनीति में हिस्सा लें और देश को बनाने के लिये जो उनका कर्तव्य है उसको पूरा करने के लिये तैयार हों और इसको रोकने के लिये अगर कोई कोशिश करते हैं तो वह गणतन्त्र को पंगु करना चाहते हैं, इसको खंडित करना चाहते हैं, देश की प्रगति के रास्ते पर रोड़ा डालना चाहते हैं। ऐसे लोग ही यह चाहेंगे कि इस किस्म का प्रस्ताव पेश किया जाये या इसकी मंजूरी हो। तो इतना कह कर मैं प्रस्ताव का सख्त विरोध करता हूँ।

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT  
(Delhi): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have

heard the speech of the Mover of the Resolution and I am very much surprised, somewhat amused also, that this particular Resolution should have come from him of all people, because the Party that he represents has done everything to use children and students for Party work and such other things coming within the scope and even outside the scope. After having done what the Party has done, it is very strange that he should have come forward with rather a high sounding speech, as if he were a professor in a classroom, a professor of ethics or something like that, whereas if I could give a little idea of what has been done to the student community by his Party, it would be a very unfortunate and sad reading indeed. He has talked about his student life, but he has not mentioned as to what his Party has done to the students, how much harm has been done to them, and what damage has been done in their work and in their functioning. If he wants a meeting of all Parties, I can understand the non-communal Parties having a meeting and coming to some agreement about something, as is the amendment of Shri Bhupesh Gupta. But how on earth we are going to come to some sort of an adjustment with this communal approach and all that is done in the name of Bharatia Sanskriti, is beyond my understanding. He has talked about what should be there and what should not be there, and so on and so forth. But to have a meeting of this kind the very first thing necessary is that they should disband all the Shakhnas that are working all over India in various cities and towns, all the Shakhnas in which very very small children are taken. Of course the Jan Sangh is highly efficient. They begin when the child is very small, they take him when he is very small. Today Mr. Vajpayee says that they are Immature, they are young, their minds are not developed their intellects are not grown, and therefore we should not touch them at all. Why did he not do it? Why did his Party not do it? If he believes in these things,

then the Party should never have allowed such things to happen if you really think that these things are wrong.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: The hon. lady Member does not know what she is talking about. Jan Sangh has nothing to do with Shakhas.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: It has something to do with Shakhas because the R.S.S. people are all working under their very close cooperation. They are the teachers in various schools. The R.S.S. people are encouraged to take charge as teachers of schools so that they can influence the mind of the young people and thereby build up a cadre of Jan Sangh-minded people. So they are deliberately encouraged to become teachers, and they tell their students that they should come to the Shakhas. In the Jan Sangh itself, the R.S.S. participate in all their processions and activities including election activities. How then can I understand that the R.S.S. is separate from the Jan Sangh? In the name of culture and sanskriti they do everything which is against religion, which is against decency, which is against goodness, and they do all things which should not be allowed. Even if you wanted to be a good Hindu, even if you wanted to be a very good Indian citizen, things which have been done by the Jan Sangh and the R.S.S. in the name of Hindu religion have all gone contrary to Bharatiya Sanskriti and Hindu religion itself. A good Hindu would not have done those things. You have not helped the cause of Hinduism or Bharatiya Sanskriti as you would like to express this term. This is one of your expressions which has come to denote more the anti-Sanskriti work than any Sanskriti work whatsoever, about which I feel very sorry because you have done tremendous damage. For example, little children all through this election have been taught highly objectionable, obscene and dirty slogans. What service did you do in the name of Bharatiya Sani-

kriti when your Party was corrupting the minds of young children? Did you ever think that these children are supposed to grow up?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: May I know, what the Congress Party did?

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: It did not do that I can assure you that.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: They have done everything. Unless there is an agreement, you cannot single out any Party. Those who sit in glass-houses should not throw stones at others. *(Interruption.)*

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: If Mr. Vajpayee is worried about it, he should look at the record of the Delhi Jan Sangh and then say anything he likes to say here. But I can tell him more about the Jan Sangh record to Delhi than he can possibly.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I know what is the record.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: He does not know what his Party is doing. I do not know how he manages his Party affairs.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: She knows what my Party is doing and I do not know,

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: I know how your Party is functioning every day and every minute. They are taught to be very brutal. They are taught not to be kind, never to have any kindness in their hearts because they might melt when they see somebody's appeals or somebody's persuasions. So they are taught to be very hard-hearted, to be able to cut people, to be able even to form a riotous mob or something, to be able to do whatever the Party dictates, and so on. The R.S.S. workers are encouraged to become teachers and to influence the students in the regular schools and colleges, and those very students are encouraged to participate in the Shakhas, which my friend cannot deny. This reminds me of the story

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht.]

which we all heard as school children that the cat after having eaten a hundred rats went for a pilgrimage.

That is how this Resolution has come. (Interruption.) I could appreciate it if your spirit was in conformity with your actions and your deeds of omission and commission which you cannot deny.

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी**  
**चौरङ्गिया :** आपके चश्मा चढ़ा हुआ है और इसलिये कुछ खास दिखाई नहीं देता ।

**कुमारी शान्ता वशिष्ठ :** आप दिल्ली में गए हैं, आपको दिल्ली का हाल नहीं मालूम । आपके चुनाव का अनुभव नहीं है ।

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौर-**  
**ङ्गिया :** आप तो दिल्ली में बैठ कर कूप संडूक से वोट करती हैं ।

**कुमारी शान्ता वशिष्ठ :** बही मैं आपको बता रहा हूँ ? आपका ज्ञान बढ़ाने के लिये बता रहा हूँ ।

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौर-**  
**ङ्गिया :** आपके दिमाग के दरवाजे बन्द हैं ।

**कुमारी शान्ता वशिष्ठ :** आपके कहने का बुझना । अच्छा जरा सुनिये, अपनी कहानियाँ और अपनी पार्टी के कारनामे सुनिये ।

Your members have taught the children obscene and dirty slogans. They have taken excessively to goondaism which became a marked feature in the last election. This very thing was perpetrated by this particular Party not only now but in the last seven or eight years. The Delhi people brought it to the notice of the Prime Minister that a lot of bad behaviour and attitude in goondaism was being perpetrated by this particular Party and that it was a very bad symptom. It was not easy to counteract this goon-daism that they were spreading.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I strongly object to what is being said against my Party. She used the word goondaism. (Interruption.) No, no, I cannot allow this expression to go unchallenged. (Interruption-) The hon. lady Member cannot describe that the creed of my Party is goondaism. I will not allow such a thing. This is the forum, we are here in Parliament. May I remind her that she is not speaking in the Gandhi Grounds? (Interruption.)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): You cannot stop her.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): One at a time please.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: If any Party has indulged in goondaism, it is the Congress Party.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: It is not so, absolutely not,

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Are we to take this discussion to this level, reduce this discussion to this level? I will not take these baseless charge\* mischievous charges lying down.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: She is relating all the facts about the misdeeds of the Jan Sangh.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: It is not, and you know it is not.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I cannot take these charges lying down. The lady Member has no right to describe the activities of my Party as goondaism.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, on a point of order. The hon. Member has a right of reply. So he can give those points then. He cannot interrupt the hon. Member's speech.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No question of right of reply. My Party is represented in this House. We are represented in Parliament. I can very well understand.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Maharashtra): Sir, on a point of order. He can say that the expression is unparliamentary. But he cannot take the procedure in his own hands.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Is it proper to describe the activities of a political party as goondaism? Is it a perfect expression?

SHRI M. M. S. SIDDHU: The question is whether the word 'goondaism' is parliamentary or unparliamentary. If it is unparliamentary, you cannot use it. But you can call a party bad. If the word 'bad' is not bad, 'goondaism' cannot be bad.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No, Sir; it is a serious matter. Let me tell the Congress Members, if you call us goondas, you will also be called goon-das.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: We cannot call you goondas, but we will call your activities as goondaism.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): 'Goondaism' should not be used. Its use has to be deprecated.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Continue your speech but do not use the word 'goondaism'.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, on a point of order. I would ask you—quite apart from this controversy, I was not participating in it—if some one of us calls a Member a goonda or that he is indulging in goondaism, that would be unparliamentary. If it is said that some organisation is indulging in certain activities which are

soondaism, that would not be unparliamentary.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Let us try to avoid the word 'goondaism'. That is all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What I say is we are sometimes accused of such things, and we never ask you to expunge it as unparliamentary even as a protest. But today, Sir, the lady Member was saying—she may be right or wrong, she knows Delhi better than I do—she was saying that the activities of a certain Party were goondaism. Now this term relates to certain activities which had taken place, according to her, outside the House. It does not relate either to me, to Mr. Vajpayee or anybody here. Therefore, the mere expression is not sometimes a vulgar expression.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Is that word to be encouraged? It has to be deprecated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For example, if I were to discuss the activities of certain Parties which indulged in rioting in some places—I am not naming any Party—shall I not call the Parties as indulging in communal violence and hooliganism? Am I committing an unparliamentary act in the House in such a situation? No. If any Member by implication or directly is called a goonda or is accused of being associated with goondaism, then he would be entitled to raise it. But as far as I could follow, Mr. Vajpayee is being treated with great respect by her. And she was telling that she did not know how Mr. Vajpayee managed the affairs of the party. That is, the presumption is that she excludes Mr. Vajpayee from what she calls goondaism there.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I join the hon. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in requesting you to reconsider your ruling because I feel that it is perfectly in order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): There is no discussion on & ruling. I have held that the word 'goondaism' is to be deprecated. That is all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Again, you are not correctly advised. Are you stating from the Chair that the word 'goondaism' is to be deprecated? Does it mean, Sir, that when 'goondaism' actually takes place, even then we cannot use the word and that has to be deprecated? You must relate it to the context in which it is used. Therefore, the word 'goondaism' may be necessary to be used.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, it is for the time that the word has been used.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That you can say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Kumari Shanta Vasishth, please continue your speech.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH:- Sir, the election . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Nothing further, Mr. Ghosh.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Vice-Chairman, is the word 'hooliganism' a good substitute for 'goondaism'?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Sapru, let her continue her speech. I have had enough discussion on that word.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right, Madam, you can use the word 'hooliganism'.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You must be a little more gracious.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Sir, I was submitting that the activities of his partymen were such that they were very, very anti-social, if I may say so; certainly their behaviour and

their actions were of a very bad type, and obscene slogans were taught to the children in every single village and an adult or grown-up person used to stand at the boundary of the village, collect the children, and they were given sweets, etc. And the whole day he taught them like a parrot: "Say this, say this, say this". This was done regularly in every single village by his partymen. And the slogans taught to the children were so obscene that I do not know what I should call it. I would not like to repeat those slogans here. But this is the Hindu *Sanskritic* life which is taught by their partymen to very small children, whose minds they had not taken into account at all. Whatever they may profess on this point . . .

SHRIMATI JAHANARA JAIPAL SINGH (Bihar): May I know the names of these villages?

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Practically every single village in Delhi, I tell you. Secondly, young women were trained by his partymen, who used to abuse the other women voters. And they used young women, young boys as their partymen and workers and they manhandled women. They were practically harassing them and they were indulging in very unbecoming and ungentlemanly behaviour. They harassed the women voters away from the polling booths. I do not know what you would like to call it. (Time *bell rings*) Sir, I may be given a few minutes more because they have taken away my time. .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): One minute more. Please wind up your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I say, the time taken by the point of order should not be included in her time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): She has already taken fourteen minutes after deducting that time. She can take one more minute.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: That type of behaviour was indulged in by those young boys and young women and by small children. This is very injurious to their own development and their own growth and for their becoming future citizens. I wondered about their development. I wondered that these elections would be over in a few days, but what was being done to damage the children was much more in terms of human material, much more wastage or damage than any results of the election could possibly be. That particular damage was done by them deliberately. Training was given to these students and youngsters to behave in such a manner, and they did behave in as anti-social a manner as they could. Therefore, I do not think that the way in which he has brought forward this particular Resolution is right. It does not at all go with their profession, with their behaviour, with their action and so on and so forth. Secondly . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Is the lady Member prepared to accept this Resolution and put us on trial? Let her come out.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Prove by your action that you believe in it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is for the House to accept it or not. The lady Member cannot accept or reject it.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Is she supporting or opposing the Resolution?

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: He does not believe in it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is at all right. Dr. Shrimali.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, here again, before you call Dr. Shrimali, I would like to say this. The normal practice is this. When we discuss Private Members' Resolutions, the Minister is called—I am saying the normal practice—just before the reply is given.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The Minister can be called at any time. He can intervene. He does not reply.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that thing. That is the normal practice. If you say that you are technically right, I cannot contest it. But then we are following a convention not for nothing because we want the discussion to go on, we want the other Members to speak and to bring their points of view, so that this is considered from a political angle and from various other angles. Ultimately the Government speaks and in the light of what has been said, the reply is given. That is very important because the ruling party is there. Now, if Dr. Shrimali speaks, well, it is not a fair discussion because many Members opposite, are naturally bound by their loyalty and so on. And I would like the Private Members to give free expression to their opinions and the Government can wait. We have got speakers on this side of the House and I suppose that there are other speakers also wanting to speak from this side. He can wait and listen to us. This is an important matter and it would be helpful to him also. Therefore, I request you to ask Dr. Shrimali to speak a little later.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the debate will end at five of the clock and the Government has every right to place its point of view before the House. That is why I am calling upon Dr. Shrimali to speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You, and not the Government, have the right to give to the Government that time. We have known debates when with the Government speech the debate ended and the reply was not given by the Mover. We have known such cases. And it will end today, I know that. It cannot go on to another day in the next session. I know the difficulty. I suggest, Sir, that we can sit, if you like, a little longer, but let the discussion go on. We will hear Dr. Shrimali later-

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL: On a point of clarification. Will hon. Members have the necessary opportunity to express their views after Dr. Shrimali replies to the debate?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Of course. He is only intervening. Dr. Shrimali.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They will have a lot of time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Let us hear him.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): Mr. Vice-chairman, Sir, . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are cutting down the time of the Private Members. I take serious objection to it because it is half past four now, and according to the rules, you may give time to the Government up to half an hour, which means that at five of the clock, the debate will end and thereafter any other Member will not have any opportunity to speak unless you say beforehand that you are prepared to sit longer. Any other Member including the person who has moved the Resolution will have no time. It is not fair, especially when you have taken away the Private Members' day last week from the schedule of business. If we had moved the Resolution . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : That is a different thing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, this is very important because Private Members' time should not be cut in this manner.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, probably you have forgotten that the House is its own master. If it wants to hear more speeches, it can certainly sit longer. Dr. Shrimali will speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very good, very courageous.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, I think We had a very interesting debate and if I may say so, of a very high calibre. Some passions were roused in the last speech which I thought was quite unnecessary. Well, Sir, it is a subject which naturally interests us because we are all deeply interested in the future generation. How they should behave, how they should think, how they should go about in the universities, is a subject of vital importance to all of us.

When I read the Resolution moved by Shri Vajpayee, I first thought that it was a Resolution which could be considered. I must say that when I heard his speech and the approach he made to the whole problem, I was disillusioned and he did great injustice to the subject by making a wrong approach.

He went back to the past social system in our country and he said that one good feature of that social system was that politics did not permeate the life and the whole social organisation, that education, culture, social organisations were not affected by the type of Governments which people had, that is, that social organisations went their own way, that Governments came in and went away.

Now, Sir, if you examine this very argument a little more deeply, you will find that this very factor was responsible for the enslavement of our people for hundreds of years. There was inertia, apathy among the people; they were indifferent. So what Mr. Vajpayee glorifies was, in my opinion, a sad feature of the Indian society in the past ages. If this kind of apathy and inertia and indifference on the part of our people continues, this will give rise to dictatorship. Fortunately in our country we had the great leader, Mahatma Gandhi, who energised national life, and today we have a very successful, a living democracy of



which we can be proud. So I am afraid I entirely disagree with Shri Atul Bihari Vajpayee when he said that there should be divorce between education and politics, that there should be complete divorce between education and politics, that politics is a part of our life.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I do not want to interrupt the hon. Minister, but what I said was this, that politics is part of life, but not the whole life, and that is the bone of contention-

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: But today you cannot ignore politics, whether you talk of culture or civilisation or education. Ultimately, all aspects of our life depend upon politics—you cannot completely ignore it. The type of Government depends on what we think and how we act in our political life, and therefore I think it will be a wrong approach to suggest that there should be indifference towards the type of Government we have. Democracy can only succeed when people are vigilant, when people are active, when people are active participants in this whole functioning of democracy. You will give rise to dictatorship if you show indifference as to what type of Government we should have. Therefore I am afraid I have to disagree with him on this aspect.

Sir, it is said that education is a preparation for life. But the real truth is that education is life itself. It is not merely preparation for life but education is life itself. It is in the educational institutions, in our colleges and universities, that the students learn the art of Government. They have their unions, they have their councils . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: They have their parliaments.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: . . ., they have elections and universities are the nurseries where democracy grows and out of which the future citizenship will develop, and therefore I do not

[limit we can completely isolate education from politics

Sir, Mr. Mani suggested many things with which I agree, but there is one point regarding which I entirely disagree with him. Mr. Mani suggested that controversial politics should not enter universities. People with different views sometimes go to the universities and campuses and place conflicting points of view before the students. University is the place where you allow the clash of ideas, where you allow different points of view and allow the students to pursue truth. If the university does not allow the conflicting ideologies to come in, what is a university for? It is in the university that truth is tested. It is in the university that different points of view are placed before the students, and then the students decide for themselves what is truth and what is falsehood. It is there that powers of discrimination develop and students learn to discriminate between good and bad.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Will the hon. Minister then permit communal ideology and its advocacy?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Well, Sir, I have said that you cannot avoid it. It is in the free market. You should allow clash of ideas, and let the students decide.

SHRI A. D. MANI: May I interrupt the hon. Minister and say what I said? I did not suggest that controversial politics should be eschewed from the universities. What I said was that controversial politics should be put in an academic way and not in a political way.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am prepared to accept that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They should be put in the way in which Mr. Mani puts his things.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: May I just remind the Education Minister of the remark of Lord Haldane that a uni-

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] versity must not be dependent for its existence either upon the State or upon the Church, and then also of Lessing's remark that if he were to choose between truth and the search for truth, he would choose the search?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Minister may be reminded \* this also. It was said in England that the Battle of Waterloo was won in the fields of Eton—that public school, you know. Such had been the expressions. Mr. Sapru knows it. Well, I do not know where it was won, but the British Conservatives used to say and take pride in it, and we should not go back beyond the time of the Conservatives.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: We should not go back to the time of the pre-historic man.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: So, Sir, I was saying that it is in the universities that this dialect of ideas must come in and should give an opportunity to students to develop powers of discrimination and judgment. That is the most important thing, because democracy cannot function unless we develop those powers of discrimination and judgment among students, and you cannot develop those powers unless you allow this dialect of ideas.

Sir, I would like to agree with my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, in many things which he said, but I do not know whether he would allow the students to have free enquiry. That is an important thing about which we must be very clear.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If my friend Dr. Shrimali, still has not that assurance from me after ten years I give him in abundance that assurance. I shall fully allow it.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am very glad to hear that when it comes from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Though in the Opposition he will allow it.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, unfortunately what happens is that in our universities very often efforts are made to use students as 'sponges, absorbing ideological juices'. These students are not to be used as sponges. They are creative beings and they must exercise their own judgment. If you allow the spirit of free enquiry in the Universities, there is no harm in placing all kinds of ideas before the students.

Sir, Prof. Ruthnaswamy—I have a great respect for him and his learning — said, "Poachers are now becoming gamekeepers and sinners are preaching against sin". It was Mahatma Gandhi who asked the students to leave the colleges and Universities. It was he who organised processions and demonstrations against a foreign power which dominated this country, which was exploiting this country. Prof. Ruthnaswamy was in the background at that time and it is all right now to sit in judgment. But I may say that it is because of these poachers that we have the opportunity to sit here in this House and express our opinions. This opportunity would not have come if these "poachers and sinners" had not been there.

He objected to civil disobedience movement and said it is recoiling on us. He mentioned the type of politics in which the students indulge. He said that they organise processions, demonstrations and picketing. I do not like processions and demonstrations. Nobody likes them. But there are occasions, when people are dissatisfied with the status quo, when people are disgusted with the existing social order, then it becomes the duty of every citizen to fight against those social evils. I would quote here from the "New Statesman" dated the 17th September, 1960, about the recent events which have taken place in American Universities. There are no

"sinners", there are no "poachers". Let Prof. Ruthnaswamy see what happens there. The report says: —

"What has been happening in the American universities in the past six months is cheerful, extraordinary and very unexpected . . . When four Negro students began, quite spontaneously, to occupy the lunch-counters in Greensboro, North Carolina, on 1 February, they released an extraordinary explosion of pent-up student enthusiasm. What has happened among the Negroes is well known, though not perhaps quite well enough: some 60 southern cities have followed the example of Greensboro and the entire structure of the Negro fight for equality, hitherto dominated by a cautious and 'co-operative' ghetto middle class, has been revolutionised.

What is not so well-known is that virtually every northern state university and large numbers of other colleges have thrown themselves with passion into the obvious form of sympathetic direct action, the picketing of northern branches of stores which segregated their lunch-counters in the South, notably Woolworths. How to help the 'sit-ins' and the analogous forms of non-violent demonstrations planned by the Negro students—'wade-ins' on segregated beaches, 'sit-ins' in polling stations next November, etc.—is probably the problems which at present stimulates student activity most."

A single event of four or five students making this demonstration had such a great impact on this great social evil which existed in that country for so many years.

It is true that I do not justify many things which our students do. Nobody does that. Organising of processions, demonstrations, strikes and picketings is not a very happy feature, but it is no use blaming the students. We

must remember that there are social evils in our society against which they must fight. It is the privilege of the youth to revolt against the social evils which exist in the society. There are many social evils about which we must be aware and youths are the vanguards of social revolution.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Provided it is spontaneous.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It was organised by Mahatma Gandhi. He was the leader of that movement.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: All these movements, Sir, have originated or have been initiated by university teachers and university professors. Even in England, so far as this Oxford Movement was concerned, the students made all the contribution.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: They were all graduates, not under-graduates.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The graduates and the under-graduates formed one community.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Why not under-graduates

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: I am speaking of historical facts. He said the Oxford movement was organised by under-graduates.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: They participated.

([Interruption, by many Hon. Members])

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): As far as possible, one hon. Member should speak at a time.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I was going to say that youths are making a new history. It is no use denying that fact and it is the privilege of the youth to revolt against a social order, a social order which has become stagnant, a social order which is stagnating, a social order which is static.

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

Well, Sir, at the present moment we are in the midst of a social and economic revolution. And sometimes the youth are impetuous, they sometimes get excited, but we have to see the cause for which they are fighting. So, I am afraid I have to disagree with my learned friend, Prof. Ruthna-swamy. I am sorry that he blamed the Civil Disobedience Movement for all the things that are happening now. What is happening all over the world? Let him read the current history.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; I should have liked to know from him what Rajaji has to say about the Civil Disobedience Movement. But for it he would not have been the first and last Indian Governor-General of India, let alone other things.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: I am not Rajaji's keeper.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: What about Cyprus, Turkey?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: There is one thing about which I wholly agree with Shri Vajpayee. This is one great wrong that we are doing. In elections we utilised the young school children. They carried flags and staged all kinds of demonstrations, and if I may give an example from my own experience, it would show what great harm we are doing to the younger generation. During one of my election tours some school children started shouting Congress slogans. Soon after that when another candidate came, they started shouting "T sf.?NT? \*rr?fcST 3T?TT" etc. That is the kind of thing which goes on. They do not understand the meaning or significance of what they are doing. Therefore, these things do great harm to their impressionable minds and I think if all the political parties can exercise restraint, at least to the extent that they do not utilise young children for such things, we will be doing a great good to our country and to the future generation.

With regard to the subject of this Resolution, this is a matter which we have to examine from all aspects. I do not rule out the possibility of examination . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; What happens to my suggestion?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: ... and we have now formed the National Integration Council which recently held its meeting last month. It meets occasionally. It is going to meet again after a few months. We have there representatives both from Mr. Gupta's party and Mr. Vajpayee's party. Mr. Vajpayee himself is a member, and there they are examining these various aspects, code for teachers, code for political parties . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; One word, Sir. It is good you have referred to this Council. There at least we are agreed on one thing, that we should evolve measures to prevent communal political activities in the country. The difference is only as to what kind of a formula should be evolved, and whether it should be by law or otherwise. If that is so, if there is this measure of agreement then why should not my amendment, that we should try and discuss this matter of keeping students out of active communal politics receive your consideration?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Is it not a fact that this Council has appointed a committee to find out what is "communalism" and how "communalism" should be defined? Let it be defined.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: All these matters are being examined by the National Integration Council, even this matter that Shri Vajpayee mentioned now for which there is a committee and Mr. Asoka Mehta is the chairman and it is examining this matter.

In view of all that, I do not think it is necessary or desirable to call another conference, because all the political parties are represented there and the Prime Minister is the Chairman of the Council. So far the proceedings of this Council have taken place in a very cordial manner and we have come to certain agreements and I hope we will also act up to them. So I am afraid I am unable to accept the Resolution which has been moved by Mr. Vajpayee. It is a matter which does need examination, but I do not think that it is necessary or desirable to call a conference to consider this matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just one word, Mr. Vice-Chairman. It is not before the National Integration Council that any person, any citizen of India should be banned from political activity. What is before the Council, of whose proceedings I am well informed, is how to deal with the question of communal activities. In that context how universities should be run and so on, is another matter, a problem of education with which the hon. Minister can deal.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: All these matters will be considered there. Anyway, I have greatly benefited from the discussion which we have had today and I think we had a very high standard of debate. I am grateful to all the hon. Members who participated in this debate. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Shri Raghunatha Reddy.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Mr. Vajpayee's reply?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. P. BHARGAVA): The Minister was only intervening, I told you.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I take this opportunity to fully endorse the remarks made by Kurnari Shanta Vasisht in relation to certain

372 R.S.—5.

activities of certain organisations when dealing with school children. In the name of "Bhakti cult", what is being taught is "hate-cult" and in the name of physical culture what is being done is to cripple the young minds at that very tender age itself.

This is a huge problem which has to be faced by everyone who is interested in the welfare of the State. Apart from this, as far as this Resolution is concerned, I may say that active politics is something different from indiscipline. Indiscipline has got its own origin and it has various factors. But it would be wrong to associate or confuse it with active politics, because unless a person has got an active mind he cannot devote himself to active thinking itself. Once there is this active thinking process, then active politics also slowly but surely would creep in. You cannot help it. Suppose a student is studying in the B.A. class or in his Honours class or even in his Intermediate class. And suppose a particular taxation measure is passed, or a particular event takes place in the country or there is a nuclear bomb exploded in a different country. You cannot prevent the students from exercising their active minds or exercising actively their minds on the problem and once there is this exercising of the mind, certain types of reactions are bound to take place in the student's mind and it may sometimes find expression in overt activities.

Probably the only argument that can be advanced from the other side would be that it is a question of mental maturity. With the question of the mental maturity of the person must be taken into consideration the question of the marginality of youth and whether formative ideas in formative minds can take place then. This question of marginality of youth would depend not only on physiological aspects, but also on psychological aspects.

[Shri K. V. Raghunatha Reddy.] My complaint at this stage is not that students are taking part in politics. I am afraid they are not sufficiently interested in politics and they are not sufficiently active. This is not because they do not want to do it. I am afraid this is due to reflection of other factors and this is so because the politicians who ought to take keen interest in what is happening in this country, are not devoting sufficient attention and are not taking keen interest in the political life of the country and in the social processes. That is why this reflection has resulted and that is why the students themselves are not taking any active interest. Once students do not take any active interest, the question of having this Resolution does not arise at all.

It is the duty of every citizen, not only of students, to take active interest in the things that concern the country, its politics and everything. The next question that can be asked is: If students take active interest in politics would not their studies get jeopardised? Shri Bhupesh Gupta has answered this point. I may also tell Prof, Ruthnaswamy and others, having myself been a member of a Senate for 12 years over which he presided for six years, that the students who were actively taking part in politics, those who took rather keen interest in the political life of the country, most of them did well in their examinations and they did much better than those students who had not taken any interest at all. I may in this context quote what Prof. D. B. Mukherjee used to say, I mean Prof. Dhurjati Prasad Mukherjee who is no more and who was a great intellectual of this country. He used to say in the Lucknow University to his students: "if you are an active political worker, and if you don't come out first in the class, then I don't want to see your face." Active care used to be devoted to these things by certain students' organisations and unfortunately they are not now as active as

they should have been. So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the question of students neglecting their studies does not arise in this context. I do not for a moment think that there is any serious politician belonging to any party, unless the person is interested in spoiling his children, who would go and advise the students; Don't study. Don't go to your classes. Come out of the colleges. On the contrary every responsible political leader, at least to the extent that I know, is sufficiently interested to tell the students: "If you want to do something for the country, then first of all, you must devote yourself to the studies and devote to your studies as much care as you would to the other activities of life." I know there are certain causes for indiscipline. But indiscipline is a pathological phenomenon and it has nothing to do with political activities. Especially at the university stage indiscipline is of a different type. It has got local reasons, or rather regional reasons and the universities themselves provide the cause for the indiscipline and not the political leaders. When such is the case, the question of blaming the political leaders should not arise in this matter. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I may humbly state that I was myself a part-time professor in a law college and I have been dealing with at least 1,000 students every year and my complaint has always been that the students were too inert and they did not take sufficient interest in all matters. I may quote here the words of Dr. Julian Huxley:

"We are living in a revolution. There is no question of stopping it. We cannot stop it. The best we can do is to see how smoothly we can make this revolution a success."

Therefore, I say, unless the youth of this country takes an active part in understanding and appreciating the social changes and processes, nothing is going to happen. Hence I strongly support the amendment of Shri Bhupesh Gupta and I hope the House

will accept it and pass this Resolution as amended by Shri Gupta's amendment, otherwise not.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA  
THE DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1962

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha: —

'In accordance with the provisions of Rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 21st June, 1962 agreed

without any amendment to the Drugs (Amendment) Bill, 1962 which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 19th April, 1962."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : May I ask the House whether the House wishes to sit a little longer?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Saturday, the 23rd June 1962.