

Ernakulam but it carries a bogey for Trichy which gets detached at Shor-anur on to its different way. So, that cannot be called a Janata train to Madras even though that nomenclature is given to that train. That also should be expedited without delay.

Then, with regard to new lines, ! Sir, even though no provision is made | in this present Budget, it is highly necessary to examine this case once again, the case of opening a line from Tellicherry to Mysore via Coorg. This is very necessary to develop Malnad area and also in view of the developing trade of that area.

With these Words, Sir, I conclude and I hope that the Minister will look into these matters, particularly the matter concerning the grievances of the employees. These are minor cases which can be remedied very easily at the level of the General Manager as well as the Divisional Superintendents. The Railway Ministry and the Railway Board must see that the General Managers are given instruction to look into the cases of promotion as well as the cases of upgrading, which the Government have already sanctioned for certain categories of employees, without any delay.

REPORT OF THE SANSKRIT COMMISSION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will now take up the Report 'of the Sanskrit Commission. Shri Ram Sahai.

श्री राम सहाय मध्य प्रदेश : उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा प्रस्ताव इस प्रकार है। मैं इसको उपस्थित करता हूँ :

“संस्कृत आयोग के प्रतिवेदन (१९५६-५७) पर, जो १ दिसम्बर, १९५८ को राज्य सभा की मेज पर रखा गया था, विचार किया जाये।”

मुझे इस बात की बहुत प्रसन्नता है कि हमको आज हाउस में संस्कृत के सम्बन्ध में कुछ अपने विचार रखने का अवसर प्राप्त हुआ है। इसमें तो कोई श्रुवहा नहीं है कि स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के बाद हमारी सारी शिक्षा-पद्धति के बारे में विचार करने के लिये सरकार ने अनेक बार कई कमीशन नियुक्त किये हैं। विशेष कर उन्होंने यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमीशन, सेकेंडरी, एजुकेशन कमीशन और आफिशल लैंग्वेज कमीशन की नियुक्ति की जिस में यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमीशन के चेयरमैन तो हमारे चेयरमैन साहब डा० राधाकृष्णन जी थे, सेकेंडरी एजुकेशन कमीशन के चेयरमैन श्री मुदालियार थे और जो आफिशल लैंग्वेज कमीशन नियुक्त हुई थी उसके चेयरमैन श्री बाल गंगाधर जी खेर थे। इन कमीशनों की रिपोर्ट को अगर हम देखें तो इन सब ने ही संस्कृत के विषय में बहुत कुछ सहानुभूति प्रकट करते हुए देश को उसकी आवश्यकता का बोध कराया है। सरकार ने जो कमीशन १ अक्टूबर १९५६ को संस्कृत के सम्बन्ध में नियुक्त किया था उसके लिये जो उन्होंने अपना उद्देश्य बताया था और अपना रिजोल्यूशन किया था, उसमें उन्होंने यह बताया था कि :

"In order to consider the question of the present state of Sanskrit Education in all its aspects, it is hereby resolved to appoint a Sanskrit Commission with the following as Members:-"

(i) to undertake a survey of the existing facilities for Sanskrit Education in Universities and non-University institutions and to make proposals for promoting the study of Sanskrit, including research; and

(ii) to examine the traditional system of Sanskrit Education in order to find out what features

[श्री राम सहय]

from it could be usefully incorporated into the modern system."

कमीशन ने बहुत गम्भीरतापूर्वक इन सब बातों पर विचार किया है। मैंने जो इस मोशन को प्रस्तावित किया उसका एक मुख्य कारण यह है कि मैं यह समझता हूँ कि हमारे भारतवर्ष की जितनी भी संस्कृति है, अर्थात् भारतीय संस्कृति है उसका कोष एक प्रकार से हमारे संस्कृत के ग्रंथ हैं। हमारी सांस्कृतिक और राजनैतिक एकता का संस्कृत का स्तम्भ है। हमारे हर प्रकार के ग्रन्थ चाहे वे धार्मिक हों, आध्यात्मिक हों, राजनैतिक हों, आर्थिक हों, सामाजिक हों, ऐतिहासिक हों, किसी भी प्रकार के हों, सब प्रकार के ग्रन्थ संस्कृत भाषा में हम को उपलब्ध हैं। अन्य विषयों पर हम जायें तो देखेंगे कि अंगार रस और वीर रस, इन में भी संस्कृत के ग्रंथ हैं। गायन के विषय में जिसका आजगल बहुत कुछ सुधार किया जा रहा है, उसके विषय में भी हम देखें तो सामवेद में उसकी काफी शिक्षा दी हुई है। मेडीकल साइंस के बारे में अगर हम अपने ग्रंथों को देखें तो आयुर्वेद शास्त्र में शारीरिक विज्ञान, निदान, निषण्टू पथ्यापथ्य शल्य शास्त्र इत्यादि सब बातों पर हमें बहुत अच्छे ग्रन्थ चरक, सुश्रुत और वाग्भट्ट बड़े श्रेष्ठ विद्वानों के लिखे हुए देखने को मिलते हैं। इतना ही नहीं शिल्प शास्त्र तथा पशु पक्षियों की जानकारी के बारे में भी हमारे यहां ग्रन्थ हैं। ज्योतिष शास्त्र एवं जहाजरानी और विमान इत्यादि के बारे में भी काफी ग्रन्थ हैं। हम देखें तो हमारे यहां जो हर एक प्रकार के विषय हैं उन में कोई भी विषय छटा नहीं रह गया है जिन पर संस्कृत में ग्रन्थ न हों। फिर भी संस्कृत की जो दुर्गत हमारी गुलामी के जमाने में हुई है वह किसी से छिपी नहीं है। आज दस वर्ष स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति को हो चुके हैं लेकिन इस वक्त भी, बावजूद इसके कि गवर्नमेंट ने कई कमीशन नियुक्त किये, सब ने संस्कृत की वकालत की है, उसकी काफी पैरवी की है और उसके बारे में बहुत कुछ अपनी इन

रिपोर्ट्स में उल्लेख किया है और उसको उपयोगिता बतायी है। लेकिन फिर भी हम देखें हैं कि हम जहां के तहां हैं। उस में हम कुछ विशेष उन्नति अभी तक नहीं कर सके। संस्कृत एक बहुत ही अच्छी विद्या है, इस में कोई भी बुराई किसी प्रकार की नहीं है बल्कि इस में बहुत ही अच्छे विचार आपको मिलेंगे। उसमें प्रेसाइसन भी है, सुनिश्चितता भी है। ऐसा कोई गुण नहीं है जो उसमें न हो। जो भी गुण किसी भी एक भाषा के लिये होने चाहियें वे सब उस में हैं। फिर भी ऐसी अच्छी भाषा के बारे में इस प्रकार उदासीन रहें यह हमारे लिये शोभनीय नहीं है। इन सब कमीशनों के बाद हमारे सामने यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन की नियुक्ति हुई, वह एक प्रकार से परमेनेंट कमीशन है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ, संस्कृत के प्रति जितनी उदासीनता इस यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन ने दिखायी है उतनी और किसी ने नहीं। उन्होंने संस्कृत के सम्बन्ध में एक शब्द भी लिखने की कृपा नहीं की। मुझे तो ऐसा मालूम होता है कि शायद वे जिस प्रकार से अपनी रिपोर्ट लिखना चाहते थे उस में उन्होंने यह खयाल किया कि 'संस्कृत' का शब्द भी उनकी रिपोर्ट में आ जायगा तो उनकी रिपोर्ट अपवित्र हो जायगी। आप देखिये, कि उस रिपोर्ट में उन्होंने हिन्दी को बैकग्राउंड में डालने की कोशिश की है। अंगरेजी को ज्यादा से ज्यादा जितनी प्रधानता वे दे सकते थे, जिस प्रकार से दे सकते थे, उस सब का उल्लेख उन्होंने किया है। उन्होंने पचीसों हेडिंग्स में कई प्रकार के प्रश्नों का अपनी रिपोर्ट में जिक्र किया है। उनके बारे में सब कुछ बताया है। लेकिन जहां तक संस्कृत का शब्द है या संस्कृत भाषा का प्रश्न है उन्होंने एक भी जगह उल्लेख नहीं किया है। मुझे ऐसा प्रतीत हुआ कि शायद किन्हीं कारणों से उन्होंने अपने टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस में वह बात न चाही हो, इसलिए मैंने यह मौजूदा रिपोर्ट जिस पर हाउस में बहस हुई वह तो देखी ही थी, लेकिन मैंने पहली रिपोर्ट भी देखी और वहां भी मैंने देखा उस में कोई ऐसी बात न

पाई जिससे संस्कृत के विषय में दो एक शब्द भी अपनी रिपोर्ट में न लिख पाते। जो पहली यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कमीशन की रिपोर्ट थी उस में संस्कृत के बारे में खास तौर पर यह कहा गया था कि जितने भी हमारे यहां इस भाषा के विद्यार्थी हों उनको इसके बारे में प्रोत्साहित किया जाय। संस्कृत के बारे में जो विचार उन्होंने प्रकट किये वे शब्द मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। उस पर आप विचार करे कि उन्होंने किस प्रकार उस में लिखा था और क्या आशा प्रकट की थी।

"Our students will be encouraged to take up Sanskrit in their Degree course."

उन्होंने यह भी कहा था :

"The Sanskrit language and literature which constitute our cultural heritage offer many opportunities for research."

ये दो खास बातें जो उन्होंने कही थीं उन के सम्बन्ध में यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन की रिपोर्ट बिल्कुल खामोश है। पहली रिपोर्ट में भी उसके बारे में कोई विशेष बात नहीं कही गई है। तो मेरा यह अर्ज करना है कि इस प्रकार की जो एक परमेनेंट बाडी हमारी शिक्षा पद्धति के लिये नियुक्त की गई है, अगर मैं गलती नहीं करता हूं तो मेरा ऐसा खयाल है कि उस ने संस्कृत के प्रति अपने कर्तव्य का पालन नहीं किया है। यह संस्कृत भाषा ही है जिसके प्राचीन ग्रन्थों में हमारी प्राचीन सभ्यता का दिग्दर्शन होता है।

आज देश में अनुशासनहीनता की बात कही जाती है, विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासनहीनता की बात कही जाती है। कहीं भाषावाद के नाम पर, कहीं किसी के नाम पर झगड़े नज़र आते हैं। उन सब का मूल कारण मैं यह समझता हूं उस धार्मिक शिक्षा की अवहेलना है जो संस्कृत भाषा के ग्रन्थों में दी हुई है। जब से हम ने उसकी अवहेलना की तब से

हम यह देखते हैं कि हमारे नगर वासियों में कहिये अथवा विद्यार्थियों में कहिये, एक प्रकार की उद्वेगता आ गई है। धार्मिक शिक्षा से जो शीलता उन में आनी चाहिये वह नहीं आई। उसी का कारण है कि आजकल जगह-जगह उपद्रव हमारे सामने हो रहे दिखाई देते हैं। आजकल विद्यार्थियों के उपद्रव इतने ज्यादा बढ़ गये हैं कि हम उनके बारे में क्या कहें। उसको किस तरह से कंट्रोल किया जाय यह बात हमारी समझ में नहीं आती है। यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में विद्यार्थियों की इन बातों का उल्लेख अवश्य किया है। उसने लिखा है कि विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासनहीनता आ गई है किन्तु उसने इसके दूर करने के बारे में कोई ठोस उपाय नहीं सुझाया है। उसने जो उपाय सुझाये हैं वे दूसरे प्रकार के उपाय हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि जिस प्रकार संस्कृत द्वारा धार्मिक और आध्यात्मिक शिक्षा दी जाती है अगर वह उसका भी उल्लेख कर देता तो किसी हद तक वे अपने कर्तव्य का पालन अवश्य करता। धार्मिक शिक्षा से मेरा मतलब यह कदापि नहीं है कि दूसरे जो हमारे भाई क्रिश्चियन या मुस्लिम इत्यादि हैं, उन्हें भी किसी इसी प्रकार की शिक्षा दी जाय या उनके धर्म की शिक्षा न दी जाये। मैं समझता हूं कि ऐसे अवसर प्राप्त होने चाहिये जिससे इस प्रकार की शिक्षा हम को मिल सके। लेकिन मैं देख रहा हूं कि इस प्रकार की शिक्षा मिलने के जो साधन होने चाहिये वे उपलब्ध नहीं हैं। हमारी संस्कृत की पुस्तकों में हमारे वेदों और दूसरी पुस्तकों में, ज्ञान का भंडार भरा हुआ है। अगर हम उस के इतिहास को देखें तो हमें बहुत प्राचीन इतिहास उनमें मिलेगा। दूसरे देशों की पुस्तकों में इतने प्राचीन इतिहास उपलब्ध नहीं हैं जितने कि हमारी इन पुस्तकों में भरे पड़े हैं। अविनाश चन्द्र दास जी ने वेदों की पुस्तकों के बारे में लिखा है कि वे २५ हजार वर्ष पुरानी हैं। तिलक ने इन्हें ४ हजार वर्ष पुरानी बतलाया है। एक अंग्रेज लेखक ने इनको २५००० वर्ष पुरानी बतलाया है।

डा० रघुवीर सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश) : उतने वर्ष ईसा के पहले की यह बात है।

श्री राम सहाय : मैंने जितने भी साल बतलाए वे ईसा के पहले के ही हैं। मैक्समुलर ने ऋग्वेद के बारे में कहा है कि यह ईसा से १२०० वर्ष पहले लिखा गया था। यह कितने दुःख की बात है कि हमारे विद्यार्थी गुलामी के जमाने में ही नहीं, विदेशी राज्य के जमाने में ही नहीं, हमारे लोग संस्कृत की शिक्षा ग्रहण करने के लिये आज भी विदेश या जर्मनी गये। लेकिन आज भी हम यह देखते हैं कि संस्कृत के जितने भी अच्छे संग्रह हैं वे सब विदेशों में ही उपलब्ध हैं। ये चीजें संस्कृत में हमारे देश में आज भी उपलब्ध नहीं हैं। जर्मनी ने निश्चय ही इस सम्बन्ध में काफी प्रगति की है। पिछले दो तीन दिन से जब मैं इस विषय में पुस्तक देखने के लिए लाइब्रेरी में गया तो मुझे वहाँ पर संस्कृत के विषय में अंग्रेजी आथर्स की ही ज्यादा किताबें मिलीं। गुरुकुल कांगड़ी के एक स्नातक की एक किताब संस्कृत के इतिहास के बारे में अवश्य वहाँ पर उपलब्ध थी। मैं इस बारे में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा देश इस बारे में कितना उदासीन है। सामवेद में गायन विद्या के बारे में काफी हम सीख सकते हैं। पाणिनी की व्याकरण की पुस्तक ईसा से ५०० वर्ष पुरानी बतलाई जाती है। उसकी सानी आज कोई दूसरी व्याकरण हमको नहीं मिल सकती है। अगर हम रामायण और महाभारत को देखें तो हमें उसमें से काफी अच्छी शिक्षा मिल सकती है। उसमें हमको यह मिलता है कि पिता का आदर्श क्या है, पुत्र का आदर्श क्या है, पति और पत्नी का आदर्श क्या है, राजा और प्रजा का आदर्श क्या था, इन सब बातों का उसमें उल्लेख है।

श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आदर्श समाज का भी उसमें उल्लेख था।

श्री राम सहाय : उसमें हमें आदर्श समाज भी मिलता है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि उसमें सभी अच्छी बातों का समावेश था।

महभारत में धार्मिक, नैतिक, दार्शनिक दृष्टि से, कर्तव्य परायणता की दृष्टि से जो शिक्षा मिलती है वैसी हमें किसी दूसरे ग्रन्थ में नहीं मिलती है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि महाभारत से धर्म, अर्थ, काम और मोक्ष के सम्बन्ध में जितनी अच्छी शिक्षा हमें मिलती है वैसी हमें दूसरी कहीं नहीं मिलती है। अगर हम कालीदास के ग्रन्थ को देखें, मेघदूत नामक ग्रन्थ को देखें तो उसमें जितनी अच्छी संस्कृत में व्याख्या की गई है उतनी और दूसरी भाषाओं की पुस्तकों में नहीं मिल सकती है। उन्होंने मेघ की कल्पना करके किस प्रकार अपनी प्रेयसी को सन्देश भेजा है, मैं समझता हूँ कि उस प्रकार का विश्लेषण, उस प्रकार की व्याख्या, उस प्रकार की उपमा, अलंकार किसी दूसरी भाषा में मिलना दुष्कर है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हमारे ग्रन्थों में इस प्रकार का साहित्य भरा हुआ था और आज उसकी जिस प्रकार से अवहेलना की जा रही है उसको देखकर दुःख होता है।

आज जिन कारणों से संस्कृत की उन्नति नहीं हो रही है उनमें से एक कारण रीजनल भाषा भी है। इस सम्बन्ध में साइन्टिफिक और टेक्नीकल एजुकेशन की ओर भी लक्ष किया जा रहा है और कुछ हिन्दी की बात भी की जा रही है। इस तरह से संस्कृत को यथोचित स्थान नहीं दिया जा रहा है और जो उसको स्थान दिया जाना चाहिये था वह नहीं दिया जा सका है।

डा० रघुवीर सिंह : हिन्दी का कोई विरोध नहीं है।

श्री राम सहाय : हम सब लोगों का भी यही ख्याल है। ये तीन कारण हैं जिसकी वजह से संस्कृत को जो उचित स्थान मिलना चाहिये था वह नहीं प्राप्त हो रहा है ऐसा मत व्यक्त किया गया है।

डा० रघुवीर सिंह : हिन्दी को संस्कृत से बल ही मिलेगा।

श्री राम सहाय : मेरा निवेदन यह है कि कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के बारे में सदन में जो बातें कही गई हैं उन पर माननीय मंत्री जी अवश्य विचार करेंगे। इस समय जो हमारे सामने बात आ रही है वह यह है कि एक तो हमें हिन्दी को प्रधानता देनी चाहिये। दूसरी यह है कि रीजनल भाषा को प्रधानता देनी चाहिये और तीसरी अंग्रेजी भाषा को प्रधानता देनी चाहिये। मेरा तो निवेदन यह है कि संस्कृत कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में यह बात कही गई है कि संस्कृत को भी इन तीन भाषाओं के साथ स्थान दिया जाना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि चार भाषाओं को स्थान देने से हमारे ऊपर कोई बोझ नहीं आयेगा। मेरा ख्याल है कि अगर अधिक बोझ आ भी जाए तो हम ऐसा कर सकते हैं कि रीजनल भाषा के साथ—जहाँ हिन्दी हो वहाँ कोई विशेष दिक्कत नहीं है—जहाँ रीजनल भाषा दूसरी हो वहाँ हम संस्कृत का समावेश कर सकते हैं। मैंने तो बच्चों में यह टेडेंसी देखी है कि अगर उनको अवसर प्राप्त हो तो वह बहुत अच्छे तरीके से दो-दो भाषायें अपनी छोटी उम्र में ही सीख लेते हैं। मैं इस बात को इस दृष्टि से निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि मैंने स्वयं अपनी ग्रैंड-डॉटर को देखा है, वह साढ़े तीन साल की है और वह इंग्लिश और हिन्दी दोनों में अच्छी तरह से बातें कर सकती है और उसमें मैंने यह विशेषता देखी है कि जब वह किसी ऐसे आदमी को देखती है जिससे कि उसे हिन्दी में बात करनी चाहिये तो वह हिन्दी में बात करती है और जब वह ऐसे व्यक्ति को देखती है जिससे कि उसे इंग्लिश में बात करनी चाहिये तो वह इंग्लिश में करती है। तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि अगर बालकों को अवसर प्राप्त हो तो उनमें इतनी योग्यता होती है कि साधारणतया अपनी छोटी उम्र में दो दो भाषायें अच्छी तरह से आसानी से सीख सकते हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a Motion, not a Resolution. The time fixed is 1½ hours. There are

number of speakers. The Minister has to reply and you have to reply.

SHRI RAM SAHAI: No doubt, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken twenty minutes. I think it is time to wind up now.

श्री राम सहाय : मैं तो यही मालूम करना चाहता था कि मुझे कितने समय में खत्म कर देना चाहिये।

श्री उपसभापति : आपने २० मिनट ले लिये हैं, अब खत्म कीजिये।

श्री राम सहाय : मैं दो, तीन या चार मिनट में ही खत्म कर दूंगा।

श्री अमोलख चंद (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आपको बाद में जवाब देने का मौका भी मिलेगा।

श्री राम सहाय : मुझे यह निवेदन करना है कि जैसा कि संस्कृत कमीशन ने रिपोर्ट में कहा है उसके मुताबिक इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि हर स्कूल में संस्कृत के पढ़ाने की व्यवस्था की जाय और यूनिवर्सिटीज को जहाँ जहाँ इसके लिये उपयुक्त क्षेत्र हो वहाँ वहाँ कायम किया जाय। इस बात की भी आवश्यकता है कि जहाँ-जहाँ जरूरत हो वहाँ-वहाँ स्कालरशिप्स देने की व्यवस्था की जाय। इस विषय में जो फारेन स्कालरशिप्स दी जाती हैं उनकी भी केवल उन्हीं विषयों के बारे में व्यवस्था की जाय जिनका अध्ययन यहाँ नहीं हो सकता है। संस्कृत की योग्यता के बारे में भी मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँगा कि कुछ लोगों का यह ख्याल है कि यह पुराने पंडितों की चीज है और शायद बहुत से लोग तो उनको कोई विद्वान् क्या मनुष्य नहीं समझते थे...

डा० रघुवीर सिंह : क्योंकि उनको अंग्रेजी नहीं आती थी।

श्री राम सहायः लेकिन जिन लोगों ने संस्कृत का अध्ययन किया और जिनको अवसर प्राप्त हुआ उनका कितना नाम हुआ है। जैसे कि हमारे चेयरमैन डा० राधाकृष्णन् हैं जिन्होंने कि सब देशों की फिलासफी की कम्परेटिव स्टडी की है और सारे संसार में संस्कृत की विद्वत्ता के लिये विख्यात है। तो मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव पर जो कि मैंने पेश किया है विचार किया जाय और शासन से निवेदन करूंगा कि संस्कृत कमीशन की जो सिफारिशें हैं उनको बहुत जल्दी और बहुत अच्छी तरह से कार्यान्वित करने का वह प्रयत्न करे।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Report of the Sanskrit Commission (1956-57), laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 1st December, 1958, be taken into consideration."

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the first thing that I would like to say about this Sanskrit Commission is that its composition was of an imbalanced character. Almost all the members were Sanskrit scholars. I do not say that you should not have had such scholars on the Commission but I think, on the whole, it would be right to say that it is desirable that such commissions should be so composed as to have the representatives of various languages, of various branches of learning, on them.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): And be at loggerheads.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I do not think my friend is taking a correct academic view in this matter.

There should have been some representatives of the regional languages; there should have been some representatives even of the sciences as we know them. The Commission,

therefore, has produced a report which in many ways is an excellent report but there are parts with which I do not agree.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to say that I yield to none in my respect for the Sanskrit language, for the achievements of our ancestors and for the many glorious things that are to be found in the writings of our great Sanskrit poets, dramatists and philosophers but Sanskrit was never the language of the common people in India. It is a disputed question whether it was ever the language of the common people. Prakrith was the language of the common people and I think, Sir, we should not pursue a policy which would force Sanskrit upon the people, whether they like it or not. I would like to see Sanskrit encouraged but I do not think it is fair to blame the University Grants Commission which was set up . . . (Interruption.) They were a modern Commission charged with the responsibility of ensuring higher standards in our Universities.

Another think that I would like to say is this. I do not like this idea of having a Central Sanskrit University or Sanskrit Universities. We have a Sanskrit University in Uttar Pradesh but my idea of a University is somewhat different from the idea of my friend, Mr. Ram Sahai. A University is a place where knowledge is co-ordinated, where you have many faculties and branches of knowledge, not one faculty. I do not like, for example, an Engineering University or a Medical University. Knowledge is one integrated whole and it is wrong to have isolated faculties or to give the name of University to an institution which concerns itself exclusively with isolated branches of study. Therefore while I would like to have many Sanskrit institutions, while I would like to see Sanskrit emphasised in schools and colleges, while I would like to see Professors of Sanskrit in our Universities, I am not prepared to have

specialised Universities for the promotion of Sanskrit language.

Then it must be remembered that Sanskrit is akin to many other Indian languages and Prakrith is derived from Sanskrit. Sanskrit should not be studied in isolation from these other languages. Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I think there is a danger in making Sanskrit or any other language compulsory. Latin and Greek which were compulsory at Oxford and Cambridge are being given up as compulsory subjects of study, because after all we are entering a modern age, an age of technology and of science, and we cannot therefore think of going back to the past.

Then I very much agree with the suggestion of the Commission that there should be a Central Institute' of Indology. We have many such institutions which are doing good work and an Institute which would bring together the various workers in the field of Indology including Sanskrit studies is desirable for the promotion of Sanskrit studies.

I would also say that I am not interested in the suggestion that we should have a system of Sanskrit Pathshalas. We have basic schools; we have Secondary schools and Higher Secondary schools, and in all these schools, starting from basic schools, Sanskrit should be given due importance. Of course, along with Sanskrit there are other languages also which are important but I think that it is not sound to suggest that the student must be made to learn three languages including Sanskrit from almost the day he starts going to school. Therefore I think a balanced view has to be taken in this matter. Sir, a good deal of good work has been done by this Commission and we are grateful to it for many useful and thoughtful suggestions but we cannot take the view that modern subjects have no importance and that Sanskrit must be preferred to modern subjects. Thank you.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must admit at the outset that we are today discussing here a very learned Report. The composition of the Sanskrit Commission was such that a Report of this high quality was expected of them. I have said it is a very learned Report and it has all the best qualities of a learned Report, and I am afraid, also the imbalance that all learned Reports suffer from. The names of the members of the Commission were sufficient guarantee that it will be a learned Report. Incidentally, I have some sympathy for what my most esteemed colleague, Mr. Sapru, said that the composition was weighted from the very beginning in favour of an absolute position for

Sanskrit. I am in general agree-4 p.M.ment with the conclusions and

findings of the Report. Everybody would agree that Sanskrit played a very important role in the shaping of our national character, in shaping our images, our ideologies, our history and culture. I quite admit that it has been one of the most important unifying factors in our national life. I admit too that it has a role yet to play. I do agree that it has been the most important vehicle of our national heritage, the one receptacle in which our national heritage has travelled across the centuries and come down to us. I quite recognise that it is the most potent instrument even today for building up our regional languages. The connotations of words, the nuances, the images, the imageries, the structure of the Sanskrit language, the grammar and syntax, etc. have very much to offer to our lisping languages including the one which we are trying to make our official or national language. It can also creatively enrich our vernaculars. All this is admitted.

But when we come to the recommendations I cannot but feel that the recommendations of the Commission have been somewhat unrealistic. They are all very learned scholars—

[Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray.] the members of the Commission—but I am afraid that they have shot a little too high. I am afraid further that they were somewhat oblivious of the perspectives against which they have been at work. I have been a life long student of Indian history and culture and I know what Sanskrit means to us. Yet, I do not see how, by accepting all the recommendations they have made, we can live in the modern context, in the very complex situation of the world in which we find ourselves. The situation in our contemporary academic world—I mean in the schools, colleges and universities—has been somewhat lost sight of by the members of the Commission, nothing to speak of the very complex and complicated situation of the world of today. For instance, the Commission has recommended that Sanskrit should be made a compulsory language in our school curriculum. The subject was discussed on very many occasions and one of the latest occasions was the last meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education. All of you know that we have adopted as one of our school policy to have the three-language formula, which roughly means the regional or the mother tongue, English and Hindi. This has meant in some of the States 3J languages perhaps. But the Commission has recommended as an alternative that four languages should be studied at the school stage. Now, imagine the increase in the content of knowledge in science, in humanities, that we are going to give to our secondary school boys and girls.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay): It has given four alternatives.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: It is only one of the variants.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Then again they have recommended that Sanskrit should not be pitted against Hindi; that is, Sanskrit should be given an absolute position. As one of those who have something to do with the framing of syllabuses and curri-

cula for the secondary schools and their integration with the collegiate course, I know how difficult we are finding it to give places to all the subjects that we have to teach to our boys and girls. Over and above all this, we now want a classical language to be made compulsory. I do not know how this can be done. I am in favour of having Sanskrit as an optional language certainly, and of doing everything that we possibly can to encourage the study of Sanskrit, not only in its traditional method of teaching but also in its modern method, not only in the schools but also in the colleges and in the universities, but to make it a compulsory subject in our schools, is somewhat unrealistic in the present context, at any rate to my mind.

Then they have also recommended that there must be at least a five-year course in school for Sanskrit to yield what we want it to give us. The learning of the language to yield what we want certainly does take five years at least but then to give five years for this compulsory language in the school stage is again, I believe, unrealistic. Nor do I think that there should be Sanskrit High Schools as such. (*Time bell rings.*) The Commission wants them to be called Sanskrit High Schools. I do not think it is feasible in our present context.

Then there are so many other recommendations into which I have no time to go. I quite agree with Mr. Sapru on the question of a Central University for Sanskrit. My idea of a University is very much like Mr. Sapru's. We belong to the liberal school of thought, at any rate, so far as educational and cultural matters are concerned. University is a thing in which the universe is reflected. It is not just for one faculty of study. In the various faculties the knowledge of the universe must be reflected. It is not of one segment of the universe, one segment of classical learning alone. Yet, I have great admiration for the way the Commission have dis-

cussed all the manners, ways and aspects in which Sanskrit studies should be encouraged in our country. This encouragement can be given in very many ways and I am sure that the Ministry of Education are thinking on those lines. At least let us hope that they will try to give effect to as many recommendations as they can by way of giving encouragement to Sanskrit studies, encouraging research in the post-graduate stage, having departments of Sanskrit, specialised departments, well-equipped departments of Sanskrit teaching in the colleges and also in the schools, integrating the Pathasala system of Sanskrit teaching with the modern system of Sanskrit teaching, and so on and so forth as recommended.

(Time bell rings.)

Lastly, I would only take one more minute and mention one point. Mr. Deputy Chairman, if I understood him aright, I mean the initiator of the discussion, Mr. Ram Sahai, he said that during the years and centuries of our foreign tutelage Sanskrit was given a very low position. This is historically incorrect. I know what the condition of Sanskrit studies in India was in the 18th century. I know what it was in the 17th century and in the 16th century. Let us not speak of the condition of Sanskrit studies in mediaeval India. Only a few pundits knew it. Only a few pundits in the Pathasalas or Chatra-salas knew it. Nobody else cared for it. Don't you ever forget it. Don't you place our nationalism on a wrong pedestal. Don't you ever forget that it was the German and British scholars that placed Sanskrit in its own place, of classical glory and made us conscious of the heritage that Sanskrit brought to us. It is not a question of politics. It is not a question of foreign tutelage or anything of the kind. Give the devil its due. They brought Sanskrit learning to the stage to which it originally belonged. And the role of Sanskrit that we are conscious of today has been mainly due to those great scholars that made us

134 RSD—5.

conscious of our heritage and made Sanskrit known not only in India, but throughout the world. Let us admit it.

Thank you.

DR. P. J. THOMAS (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am very happy to participate in this discussion because I come from a part of India where Sanskrit has been learnt and learnt with great interest for a long time in the past and where all classes of people have been learning Sanskrit. I still remember when I was a boy almost in every school Sanskrit was being taught and further I remember my mother telling me to learn Sanskrit and not English and particularly she wanted me to study the Ramayana and other classics rather than go in for foreign books. And in my part of the country, as I said, we have been wedded to Sanskrit for a very long time and we still are wedded to it.

As Mr. Ram Sahai pointed out, Sanskrit has a much more unifying influence linguistically than Hindi and so on. When Mr. Ram Sahai or Mr. Tandon speaks Hindi, I understand them, because they use more Sanskrit words. But, when Pandit Nehru speaks, I cannot understand much of it, because, I suppose, he speaks more of Urdu. I very much value Hindi with more and more Sanskrit words and we have no difficulty at all. We understand that. And all the parochialism will go. We will appreciate it. We are accustomed to Sanskrit. So, even on political grounds, on sentimental grounds, I prefer more and more Sanskrit being used. The reformed Hindi that people have been making in this country, to my mind, is not very helpful.

There are some important points made in the Report. I agree with Dr. Sapru and Dr. Ray that it is not desirable to have a Sanskrit University. At least, if you cannot have a Sanskrit University, cannot we do here what they do in Oxford and Cambridge?

[Dr. P. J. Thomas.] There, they give courses in humanities based on Latin and Greek—and important subjects—history, philosophy and all that. For a long time it was the most important of the Oxford degree courses and even now I think it is a very important course. Today, at least here in this country can't we have something like that? That is to say, can't we have a cultural course with Sanskrit as the base and philosophy, history and other allied subjects put together and thus build on the roots in the country, rather than prescribe a few books in Sanskrit to pass an examination. We want something more than that, in every University to have a course on humanities with Sanskrit as the base and thus have in this country several people who are scholarly, who can go abroad to England, America, Russia, China, everywhere. There, as pointed out in the Report, they can have a section in our Embassy where our culture will be represented. I know from Mr. K. P. S. Menon how they in Russia value Sanskrit studies. Why? Because Mr. Menon himself is a scholar of high merit. We want in every Embassy an Indian culture section with competent persons and with all the books and so on, so, that people there may know the value of our old culture.

Then, Sir, as the Commission says, cannot we, when we take our oath in Parliament, use Sanskrit? For taking oath we certainly ought to prefer Sanskrit to English or even our own language. Also for taking oaths in the courts, and in our schools, we may use some Sanskrit sloka or Sanskrit prayer, which is familiar to all, thereby kindling our enthusiasm, and we can feel we are all one. Whatever be the faults of the Commission Report, I feel that the Commission has done a great service by bringing out this fact that Sanskrit is a much more unifying factor than Hindi or anything else. I certainly agree with the two previous speakers that we cannot have Sanskrit Universities. But

we should have in every University, a Sanskrit branch, like humanities in Oxford and Cambridge—not merely studying a few books in Sanskrit.

In this way the discussion on the motion moved by Mr. Ram Sahai is to the good, in my opinion. Although I cannot claim to speak for other Members from Kerala here, I am sure that when Hindi is spoken with Sanskrit words there will be no difficulty at all in Kerala. If anybody wants to make Hindi compulsory, then many may not be able to tolerate it, but there are better chances with Sanskrit words in it. There can be also the use of the Devanagari script, but use Sanskrit words and not new-fangled Hindi words and expressions lately made by people. Thank you.

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO: (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, there is no doubt that the Sanskrit Commission has produced a weighty report. It is weighty both literally and figuratively. Moreover, it is unanimous. But I should confess that I am impressed neither by the weight of the report nor by its unanimity. As my hon. friends, Dr. Sapru and Prof. Ray, have pointed out, the Commission has been loaded with Sanskritists. I do not know whether the Secretary of the Commission is a Sanskrit scholar or not, but . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, Prof. Dandekar is a great Sanskrit scholar.

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO: If every member of the Commission is a Sanskrit scholar, it is no wonder that they have produced a unanimous report. If today we appoint a Commission to report to us on co-operative farming with, say, Rajaji as Chairman and Mr. Masani, Mr. Munshi and Mr. Ranga as members, I am sure they will produce a unanimous report. But of what use will that report be? As such, in spite of the unanimity of this Report, I feel that it is wholly one-sided and it has

throughout exhibited rather a narrow outlook.

AN HON. MEMBER: Your outlook is narrow.

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO: I am second to none in believing that Sanskrit is a great language, it is a classical language. It did serve a great purpose in bringing about a sort of uniformity in the culture of India. I am not denying all these things, but at the same time, it cannot be denied that it was never a popular language. Even as long back as the 5th century B.C. it ceased to be a popular language. That is why the great Lord Buddha gave his message to the people in Pali language which is different from Sanskrit. Not only that, in Indian history . . .

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Pali was not the language of the Buddha.

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO: If so, it was Prakrit, some form of Prakrit.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I think it was Magadhi.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY: Let us not enter into a linguistic controversy.

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO: Anyway, the point that I am making out is this that whenever a great teacher wanted to give a new message to the people, he used some popular language or ether and not Sanskrit. You take the great Chaitanya. He did not teach in Sanskrit. You take the great Saivite teachers of the South or the great bhaktas of the North like Ramanand, Kabir, Tulsi Das and others. They did not give their messages in Sanskrit. So, the point that I want to make is ...

DR. P. J. THOMAS: Sankaracharya spoke in Sanskrit.

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO: I wonder how far Sankaracharya gave a new message or how far he tried to approach the people. So, I

say that as Sanskrit was never a popular language and as it was associated more or less with a class or two, it cannot serve any useful purpose in the contemporary world. I may not be a Sanskrit scholar. But here is Damodar Dharmanand Kosambi who is a Sanskrit scholar and this is what he has got to say about the merits—rather, about some of the demerits of the language:

"Sanskrit language suffered from its long, monopolistic association with a class that had no direct interest in technique, manual operations, trade agreements, contracts, or surveys. The class did have leisure enough to write their tenuous ideas in a fortuitous manner above the reach of the common herd . . .".

So, Sir, when we are trying to build up a new society and when we are trying to give a new message to the people, Sanskrit, I am sure, would not serve quite a useful purpose. But at the same time I would not say that Sanskrit should not be encouraged in any way; it should be encouraged. As a matter of fact, many of the languages—why, all the languages of the North—are directly derived from Sanskrit. All the languages of the South, which are of a Dravidian origin, have borrowed largely from Sanskrit. So, for the further growth of all our languages, the study of Sanskrit is certainly necessary. But that study of, or that encouragement to, Sanskrit should be confined to those who want to specialise in linguistics, who want to do research work, but trying to make it compulsory and forcing the common man to learn it, will do absolutely no good to anybody.

My friend here was saying that if Sanskritised Hindi came more and more into vogue, it would help the people. I wonder whether he knows that some of the Sanskrit words do not convey the same meaning in the various languages of our country. For instance, the word 'sansar' would mean "the world" to a Hindi man; it means the 'wife' to a Tamilian;

[Shri N. Venkateswara Rao.] it means 'family life' to a Telegu man and it means for my friends from Kerala 'small talk'. Or, take the word 'sashpa'. I am told that it means in Bengali, the young shoots of green grass, whereas in Telugu, it has got a rather vulgar meaning. I understand that the word 'uparathi' in Marathi means repentance, whereas it has again got a rather vulgar meaning in Telugu.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Do not the environments make them so?

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO: Thus the same Sanskrit word may thus convey different meanings in different languages. We find lots of other defects too in the Sanskrit language. It has too many synonyms, too many words to convey the same meaning. Another great defect is, one word having too many meanings. That is why it is never precise and because it lacks precision, I am afraid it cannot be used with good effect for propagating scientific knowledge.

As the time at my disposal is very short, I will now come to my final point. Sir, the Sanskrit Commission says in its Report that "Sanskrit does not possess merely an academic or a purely intellectual interest, it is a "Way of Life." I emphasise this. They say that 'it is a Way of Life'. It is exactly the reason why I am opposed to the great importance which the Sanskrit Commission attaches to this particular language. I am for a new way of life. I am not for the way of life for which the Sanskrit language, Sanskrit literature and Sanskrit culture stand. That particular way of life which the Sanskrit Commission commends denied the people equality before law. It denied the people equality of opportunity. It created the caste system. It condemned the vast mass of the people to untouchability.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Are these the offences of the Sanskrit language? If you hold that

view, you are hopelessly mistaken.

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO: No, no. You are mistaken.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): He is speaking about "a way of life."

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO: I am talking about "a Way of Life". The Sanskrit Commission says very definitely and categorically that the Sanskrit language stands for "a Way of Life." I am opposed to that way of life. Not only myself, but our Constitution also is opposed to it for that way of life negates the Directive Principles of our Constitution. As such, I say too much importance should not be given to the Sanskrit language. Certainly, it should be encouraged in so far as it is going to help linguistics, in so far as it is going to help research scholars. But certainly it should not be made compulsory; certainly, it should not be given more importance than Hindi or even equal importance with Hindi, because sooner or later, Hindi should become our national language; it should become our official language, and Sanskrit should never be allowed to come in the way of Hindi becoming the official language.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Apart from the Minister and the Mover of the Resolution there are six more speakers. I think the House will have to sit a little longer.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: It is not on account of this but on account of the Message from the Lok Sabha on "Vote on Account".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Till six if necessary, but no Member can take more than ten minutes.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must say at the very beginning that I feel that the time that has been given for discussion of this Report of the Sanskrit Commission is extremely inadequate.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Please go on, Dr. Barlingay.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) in the Chair]

श्री किशोरी राम (बिहार): हिन्दी में भाषण होना चाहिये।

श्री व्यंकट कृष्ण ढगे : हिन्दी में बोलिये।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Why not speak in English?

डा० डब्ल्यू० एस० बालिगे : चूँकि बहुत लोगों का यह ख्याल है कि मैं हिन्दी में बात करूँ इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दी में ही भाषण करना उचित होगा।

श्री हर प्रसाद सबसेना : उनका विचार नहीं है, आप्रह है कि आप हिन्दी में बात करें।

डा० डब्ल्यू० एस० बालिगे : बहुत से लोग समझते हैं मैं कुछ संस्कृत का पक्षपाती हूँ, अभिमानी हूँ। यद्यपि मैं संस्कृत का अभिमानी हूँ तथापि मैं यह नहीं चाहूँगा कि संस्कृत को दैनिक जीवन में ऐसा स्थान दिया जाय जो आज की देश की परिस्थिति में उचित न हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि संस्कृत भाषा बड़े महत्व की भाषा है और वह कितने महत्व की है इस संबंध में बहुत से लोगों ने पहले ही अच्छे विचार प्रकट किये हैं। उन बातों को केवल दोहराना मैं समझता हूँ व्यर्थ ही बात है। लेकिन साथ ही साथ एक चीज बिल्कुल स्पष्ट होनी चाहिये, वह यह कि संस्कृत कितनी भी महत्व की भाषा हो, वह हिन्दी का स्थान कभी नहीं ले सकती। इसका कारण यह है कि संस्कृत भाषा, जैसा कि कुछ महाशयों ने कहा है, यदि आप पूरे हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास लें तो संस्कृत भाषा कभी सामान्य लोगों की बोली नहीं थी, मेरा आशय क्लासिकल संस्कृत से है। वेदों की भाषा जो है वह सामान्य लोगों की

बोली थी। वैसे पाली, प्राकृत आदि दूसरी भाषाएँ भी सामान्य लोगों की भाषाएँ थीं। लेकिन पाणिनी की संस्कृत भाषा सामान्य लोगों की बोली थी या नहीं इसके बारे में बहुत भारी संशय है। इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि संस्कृत भाषा को सामान्य लोग नहीं समझते थे। यह भी बड़ी भारी भूल है अपने देश में। जो रंडित, जो शिक्षित लोग थे उनकी आपस में बात करने की जो भाषा थी वह संस्कृत थी, इसमें भी जरा भी शक नहीं है। लेकिन इन सब बातों के संबंध में कुछ कहना, मैं समझता हूँ बिल्कुल फिजूल है। आज सचमुच में हम लोगों के सामने जो सवाल है, वह यह नहीं है कि संस्कृत भाषा ने जाति संस्था उत्पन्न की या संस्कृत भाषा में जो शब्द हैं उनके कितने अर्थ होते हैं। यह तो मैं समझता हूँ एक फिजूल सी बात है, इसमें बहस करना केवल समय गंवाना है। लेकिन हम लोगों के सामने मुख्य प्रश्न यह है कि आज की देश की हालत में संस्कृत का अपने जीवन में कौन सा स्थान है, यह सब से महत्व की बात है और इसको हम लोगों को भूल नहीं जाना चाहिये।

मेरा आपसे एक निवेदन है कि हम लोगों को इस रिपोर्ट के ऊपर वादविवाद करने के लिये जो समय दिया गया है वह इतना कम है कि मैं समझता हूँ, इस हाउस को जो डिगनिटी है और जिस किस्म का वाद विवाद और चर्चा यहाँ होना चाहिये और होता है, उसको दृष्टि में रखते हुए वह अत्यंत अनुचित है और इसलिए यह वादविवाद केवल एक फार्स बन जाने वाला है। मैं समझता हूँ, कम से कम एक दिन तो इसके लिये अवश्य दिया जाता तब कि सब लोगों को इस संबंध में कुछ अच्छे चीजें कहने का मौका मिलता। पहले एक घंटा था, फिर डेढ़ घंटा हो गया। लेकिन मुझे बड़ा अचरज मालूम पड़ता है कि क्यों एक या डेढ़ घंटा इस हालत में उन चीजों के लिये दिया जाता है जिन पर दा या एक दिन

[डा० डब्ल्यू एस० बालिगे]
भी बहस हो तो भी मैं समझता हूँ एडीक्वेट नहीं होगा।

उप सभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू): डाई घंटे अब आपको मिल गये।

डा० डब्ल्यू एस० बालिगे : दूसरी बात जो इसके संबंध में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि यद्यपि हमारे जो माननीय सदस्य राम सहाय जी हैं, उन्होंने इस रिपोर्ट के बारे में वाद विवाद करने का एक नोटिस दिया है तथापि आज हम इस संबंध में वाद विवाद करें, यह मुझको ठीक नहीं लगता। इसका कारण यह है कि इस रिपोर्ट के बारे में वादविवाद करने से पहले अगर हम लोगों के सामने यह चीज आ जाती कि ये जो बहुत सी रिकमंडेशंस संस्कृत कमीशन ने की हुई हैं इनमें से कौन सी गवर्नमेंट ने मंजूर की हैं, कौन सी ग्रहण की हुई हैं और ऐसी कौन सी रिकमंडेशंस हैं, जिनको वह अनुचित समझती है। अगर यह चीज हम लोगों के सामने आ जाती, तो बड़ी अच्छी बात होती और तब जो वादविवाद होता वह सफल होता, फुटफुल होता। आज तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि सचमुच मैं क्या बोलूँ। मैं संस्कृत भाषा के बारे में बोलूँ तो एक घंटा बोल सकता हूँ, गुणगान करना चाहता हूँ तो गुणगान भी कर सकता हूँ। लेकिन आज संस्कृत का गुणगान करूँ या न करूँ, उसकी निन्दा करूँ या प्रशंसा करूँ इसके संबंध में कोई इश्यू भी नहीं है। इसलिये संस्कृत कमीशन ने जो रिकमंडेशंस की हैं, ऐसी कौन सी रिकमंडेशंस हैं, जो हम एक्सेप्ट कर लें, ग्रहण कर लें और ऐसी कौन सी हैं जो अनुचित हैं। इसके संबंध में जब तक गवर्नमेंट के ख्यालात हमको मालूम नहीं होते, तब तक इस विषय पर हम क्या कहें। यह सचमुच में मेरे सामने सवाल है। यद्यपि अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने यह कहा—और मैं आपसे पूरा पूरा सहमत हूँ—आपने यह कहा कि आपकी जो यूनिवर्सिटी

की कल्पना है वह थोड़ी न्यायी है। मेरी भी जो यूनिवर्सिटी के बारे में कल्पना है वह करीब करीब आपसे मिलती जुलती है, यह मैं साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन संस्कृत यूनिवर्सिटी होनी चाहिये या नहीं, इस संबंध में जब विचार करते हैं तब उसका निर्णय केवल डाइना से नहीं होना चाहिये मेरा आपसे यह कहना है कि आज जिन यूनिवर्सिटीज में संस्कृत के बड़े-बड़े अध्यापक हैं, विद्वान हैं, उनमें भी संस्कृत की शिक्षा की आज क्या हालत है? आज आप देखिये तो आपको मालूम होगा कि बाकूई यूनिवर्सिटी की क्या ज़रूरत है?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): YOU have exceeded your time now.

डा० डब्ल्यू एस० बालिगे : यह तो मैं नहीं कहता कि संस्कृत कमीशन एक फार्स बन गया है. . .

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: But we are sitting up to 6 o'clock, you may give him more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Since there are other speakers also, I am very sorry.

डा० डब्ल्यू एस० बालिगे : आपका कहना बिल्कुल ठीक है, अध्यक्ष महोदय, किन्तु . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I have always been myself a victim of this time limit.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Therefore you will appreciate the difficulty.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I think, you better wind up.

डा० डब्ल्यू एस० बालिगे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे बड़ी नम्रतापूर्वक निवेदन

करना चाहता हूँ कि जिन नियमों के अनुसार रिजोल्यूशन के लिये इतना कम समय दिया जाता है, उन नियमों में परिवर्तन करने की बहुत जरूरत है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I agree with you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I understand the House will be sitting till 7 o'clock. With the permission of the House, you can continue.

डा० डब्ल्यू० एस० बालिंगे : मैं जानता हूँ समय नहीं है। मैं एक सेंटेंस में खत्म करता हूँ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is one of the rare scholars that we have got.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I do not deserve that compliment.

(Time Bell rings.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): YOU would have been well* advised to speak in English because you would have been able to say more than what you have said.

डा० डब्ल्यू० एस० बालिंगे : मैं दो सेंटेंस बोल कर खत्म कर दूंगा। मैं यह कहता था कि आज संस्कृत में जितना ज्ञान है—आप केवल वेदान्त को ही ले लीजिये, न्याय को ही ले लीजिये, आयुर्वेद को ले लीजिये, साइंटिफिक ग्रन्थों को ले लीजिये, कितने ही साइंटिफिक ग्रन्थ मैं आपको बतलाता हूँ। मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपके मन में जिस किस्म की यूनिवर्सिटी बनाने का विचार है, उस किस्म की यूनिवर्सिटी के लिये जो संस्कृत के स्कालर हैं, क्या उन्होंने पाणिनी का ग्रामर पूर्णतया पढ़ा है? मेरे पास इस समय इतना समय नहीं है, नहीं तो मैं आपको बतलाता कि वेदान्तों में क्या-क्या लिखा हुआ है, व्याकरण में क्या है और न्याय के सम्बन्ध में क्या-क्या पढ़ा हुआ है। इसलिये सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यूनि-

वर्सिटी के सम्बन्ध में मेरी और आपकी जो कल्पना है वह न्यायी नहीं है। लेकिन जो हालत आज हमारे देश में संस्कृत विद्या की है उसको दृष्टि में रखते हुए मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम हमारे देश। एक यूनिवर्सिटी संस्कृत की सेण्टर की हो, उसके बगैर हमारी संस्कृत की विद्या, हमारी संस्कृति, जीवित नहीं रह सकती है। मैं आप को बताना चाहता हूँ कि मैं कोई ऐसा आदमी नहीं हूँ कि मेरी दृष्टि भूतकाल की ओर यही है, मेरी दृष्टि भविष्य की ओर भी है, लेकिन सवाल यह है कि आज अगर हम देश में यूनिटी चाहते हैं तो हम यह तो नहीं करेंगे कि इधर से कुछ लायें, उधर से कुछ लायें, कुछ अंग्रेजी लायें। . . .

(Interruptions.)

. . . यह चीज नहीं हो सकती है। मेरे पास समय नहीं है। मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, when we are discussing the Sanskrit Commission Report . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Please speak in Telugu.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I wish I could speak in Telugu but the only thing is that to speak in Telugu prior permission of the Chair is necessary. It is exactly like Sanskrit. You do not expect me to speak in Arabic, Urdu or Persian. So the next best alternative for me is to speak in English because I was taught Sanskrit also in my childhood in English.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, when we are discussing this issue, I think it should be done in right focus and correct perspective. No amount of sentimentality will help the object of popularising Sanskrit unless we put it in a correct perspective of present-day realities. Sanskrit is a great language. Sanskrit did contribute to the development and enrichment of all our languages. But Sanskrit, as has been said by you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, was never a popular language.

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.] guage. The meaning of Sanskrit Bhasha itself is that it is a cultural language; it is a reformed language.

WPSVI foiTT TTf | f-W^I So it was never a popular language. It was always the language of the few. Even in Sanskrit dramas, it is only the Uch-patra-^^{that} ^STTPT^{use}

Sanskrit. The Nich patra — ;fNqTT — use Pali or Prakrit, which was the spoken language.

It is wrongly said that the north Indian languages, for instance, Ben. gali, or Hindi—Hindi is only of recent origin—Avadhi or Braj Bhasha, are derived from Sanskrit. They are derived not from Sanskrit but from Prakrit. What I mean to say is that this Sanskrit was never a popular language as such. That does not mean that it did not contribute to the enrichment of our culture. We had great literature in Sanskrit; there is no doubt about that. Sanskrit literature is second to none in the world literature—perhaps it excels in some cases when compared with other classical languages also. But that does not mean that we should take an attitude that everything is there in Sanskrit. The honourable mover of the motion said that whatever knowledge is wanted, it was already there in Sanskrit. I can understand it if you had taken that attitude when we were fighting the British, when the British were telling us that India had no culture, had no past. Then we used to look back and say, "Oh, here we have got a hoary language where we have got everything." I know in my childhood the first aeroplane had come. It was said that these were there in Rigveda days. It was later stolen from the Vedas and it was from there that they have evolved their aircraft. It is the same attitude that Shri Ram Sahai has taken. Today that attitude will not help us. To gain modern knowledge exactly we must know what modern type of aeroplanes . . .

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: But there were aeroplanes.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: There were aeroplanes, Mr. Vice-Chairman, but they were in the imagination of these writers; they were not in material existence.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: They were in material existence.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I do not want to enter into this argument with my hon. friend as far as metaphysics is concerned. I can argue on written facts of history but not on metaphysics.

" SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If we had aeroplanes then, we would be living in a different world now.

* SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: It was in those days to oppose the British that we used to say that we were proud of our culture, but it is not correct to say that every modern knowledge was there previously in Sanskrit and what we have to do now is to explore it, to study and disseminate that knowledge. It is not a correct thing.

While saying that Sanskrit is a hoary language, I have also to point out that because of the influence of Sanskrit some of the languages did not develop to their full stature as they ought to have done. Take for instance my own literature, the Telugu literature. There was one era, the Pravanda era. There, of course, the rich imagery of Sanskrit is adopted to Telugu, there is no doubt. There were days when 80 to 90 per cent, of our verses were Sanskrit. It did help us to enrich our literature, there is no doubt. But, at the same time, it did not help us to develop the native genius of our language.

So, when we are talking today of Sanskrit, while rightly appreciating the heritage of Sanskrit, while rightly appreciating the contribution Sanskrit made to all the regional languages,— I would not say regional languages, I call every language recognised in the Constitution as a national language—I should say to every national language in India, at the same time today there are a good many limitations for propagation of Sanskrit.* If understanding all these things we say today that Vaidik karma should be propagated through the Universities, this is certainly something beyond the comprehension of a man like me. Here, Sir, after saying all these things the Commission says what? The first variant they suggest is that three languages should be studied. For the first five classes the Commission rightly recommends that stress should be on the teaching of the mother tongue. Quite so. But as far as my own personal experience goes, if language is introduced at a very early stage, the unfortunate thing is that we shall be jack of all and master of none. My unfortunate experience was that I was taught Telugu grammar or something of Sanskrit grammar by rote: ^j-jr:

TIT^ XJ^V' ^e method of teaching was learning by rote. The Telugu grammar, when it was taught, it was taught to me through the medium of English. Instead of *Karta, Karma* and *Kria*, I was taught Subject, Object and Predicate. So, what I suggest is that if one has an analytical knowledge of any particular language, it is not difficult to learn other languages. Unless one has got a thorough understanding of a language, analytical understanding of a particular language, it is unnecessary to go into the details of the study of another language. So what I mean to say, Mr. Vice Chairman, is that a student of a particular age, I think preferably up to the secondary stage, should be given a thorough grounding in his own mother tongue; in an analytical way it should be taught. Once it is taught, it is not difficult to learn either English or

Sanskrit in not more than say one or two years. Otherwise, if we are teaching Sanskrit as in the days of old, even after eight years of learning of Sanskrit it will be just like me; I know nothing except some of the slokas. So, this system of imparting too many languages and cramming the brain of a child with all those things at a tender age does no good.

Apart from that recommendation of imparting languages it is said on page 271 of the Report:

"The Commission recommends that gifted exponents of the Ramayana, the Mahabharata, the Gita, the Puranas, etc., should be employed in Community Projects and National Extension Service Schemes for the inculcation among the masses of the proper ideals of conduct and character, and that the Religious Endowment Boards and Temple Departments, functioning in some States, should also employ such exponents of the Epics and the Puranas for regular as well as occasional expositions, etc., etc-----"

I can understand if the Commission recommends study of Sanskrit. Here they recommend the study of theology. I think it is not in the terms of reference of the Commission that they should recommend the ways and means of trying to promote theology. Certainly theology can be taught, there is no doubt, and I have no objection to that. But it cannot be through the medium of the Government agencies like Community Projects where so many people of other communities might live. I perfectly agree with my hon. friend . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): That would be against the spirit of a secular State.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Then we shall be negating the very spirit of our Constitution, if we begin to teach the Mahabharata and Ramayana, the theological aspect of the Mahabharata and Ramayana, not the literary aspect of the Ramayana and the

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.] Mahabharata from the Community Centres and the Social Education Centres.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Where is the theology in the Mahabharata?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Anyway, I do not claim to be a pundit on theology.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You have exceeded your time.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Just one moment and I am concluding, Mr. Vice Chairman.

What I suggest is that Sanskrit must be encouraged from an academic point of view. It should never be made compulsory. That is my first point. The second thing is that Sanskrit can never be imposed from the top. It must be voluntarily taught by the Universities and learnt by the people. It can be made an optional language. I am not for any heavily Sanskritised language as such, because it shall never be popular, if this highly Sanskritised form is kept up. I do not know about Bengali and other languages but I know certainly that in my own language there was a big campaign in the 1920s to make the language easier, to rid it of some of the highly Sanskritised words, so that the language could be made popular, so that the literature could be brought to the masses. Language is a very live affair and if you again want to bind it down just like the grammar rules of Panini, and just introduce that system of Sidhanta Kaumudi—'Kaumudi' meaning moon light, but actually it is such a bugbear to the students—Mr. Vice Chairman, I think no other occasion will come to me to give my examination on Sidhanta Kaumudi—I think no useful purpose would be served today by imposing such things on other languages also.

Lastly, I want to say one thing. We are not against Sanskrit teaching at

all. But it should be taught absolutely on a voluntary basis. No useful purpose would also be served by establishing such a thing as a separate Sanskrit University. Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray has very clearly stated that there should be no University concept about Sanskrit, not in a literary sense but if it is taken in a cultural sense, that is a different matter. I think, Sir, no useful purpose would be served by having such a University. In every University you can have a Sanskrit Chair, there can be post-graduate study of Sanskrit. I agree with one aspect of it that for post-graduation in any Indian language, Sanskrit could be made a secondary language, it could be even a compulsory language for the Honours and postgraduate study in Indian languages, because if you want really to master any of the Indian languages, a study of Sanskrit is certainly necessary, whether it is Telugu, Malayalam or whatever it is. Certainly on that aspect I wholeheartedly agree with it but the other recommendations, Mr. Vice Chairman, of the Commission are impracticable and would not fit in with the present day realities.

5 P.M.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we shall be able to appreciate better the labours of the Sanskrit Commission if we bear in mind its terms of reference which were:

"(i) to undertake a survey of the existing facilities for Sanskrit Education in Universities and non-University institutions and to make proposals for promoting the study of Sanskrit, including research; and

(ii) to examine the traditional system of Sanskrit Education in order to find out what features from it could be usefully incorporated into the modern system."

The Commission, as its terms of reference show, was entrusted with one

duty only, namely, the making of recommendations for the advancement of Sanskrit studies and research in Sanskrit and it has discharged that task, I think, with conspicuous ability, j There are many of its recommendations that we can all agree with, particularly those that relate to the raising of the standard of teaching in Sanskrit in our Universities and the provision of adequate assistance for research in Sanskrit studies. But unfortunately the Commission does not seem to have made any effort to co-ordinate its recommendations with the needs of modern life. We shall soon consider the report of the Official Language Commission. For, this problem has given rise to no little controversy in some parts of India. It is one of those subjects that is exercising the minds of the people in all the States. It is, therefore, necessary to see what relation the recommendations of the Sanskrit Commission bear to the future official language.

I cannot read out the complete language formula recommended by the Commission because there is no time for it but I shall read out two parts of it. The Commission says:

"That Hindi should be taught at the CoLege stage to such students as desire to enter all-India services; or, if it is to be taught in the School, the three language-scheme recommended by us above should be so modified that Hindi, or, for Hindi-speaking students, some other modern Indian language, preferably South Indian, is allowed as an alternative to English."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): How has the Commission made this recommendation having regard to their terms of reference?

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The Commission made such recommendations as, in its opinion, were necessary in order to strengthen the foundations of Sanskrit learning in India. It has

pointed out in the body of its report that it had to take account of the teaching of Sanskrit in the schools because the standard of Sanskrit teaching in the Universities is dependent on the standard of such studies in Secondary Schools and it has made a recommendation which assigns a greater importance to the study of Sanskrit than to the study of English. If Hindi is to be learnt, it should be allowed as an alternative to English. Can we at the present time, assign such an inferior position to English as seems to have been assigned by the Commission? Again the Commission recommends a pattern for the study of languages in Schools and then says as follows:

"The Commission thinks that it is not advisable to add the burden of Hindi as the fourth language at the School stage. The best results, in the opinion of the Commission, will be achieved if Hindi is made a subject of study at the CoLege stage, on the basis of a knowledge of the mother-tongue and Sanskrit."

This seems to me to go, unfortunately, both against our needs at the present time and against the Constitution. There are other recommendations, too, made by the Commission. It has said that if there is no other way out of the difficulties with which it was faced, it should be quite practicable to teach four languages in the Secondary Schools. It thinks that this can be done without putting any undue burden on the students. Now, four languages are taught in the Secondary Schools in Germany . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): They have to learn other subjects like biology, chemistry etc. . . .

(.Interruptions.)

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: My point of view is the same as yours in this matter and that of Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray who has spoken with great ability on this subject. I am aware of the fact that four languages are taught in the Secondary Schools in Germany

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru.] but can we teach four languages efficiently in our own country? Can we, bearing in mind, the condition of our Secondary Schools, claim, that even three languages can be properly taught in the Schools? I therefore entirely agree with Dr. Ray that it is unrealistic to say that the students should be asked to learn four languages simply in order to compel every student to learn Sanskrit in the Secondary Schools. The question was considered by the University Grants Commission. The Commission had no bias at all against the study of Sanskrit.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Shri Ram Sahai made that point.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: We had absolutely no bias. The matter was considered by a Committee of which the Chairman was Mr. Chiritaman Deshmukh.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): He was himself a great Sanskrit scholar.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: But the Commission found it difficult to support the recommendations of the Sanskrit Commission. I don't think that there is any Member of the Commission who would not like to promote the study of Sanskrit in this country. I, Sir, personally desire that India should be a place to which scholars from all over the world should flock for higher Sanskrit studies. We should go, not to France or Germany or Russia or any other country for the study of Sanskrit. We should develop it to such an extent that scholars from other countries may come to India to sit at the feet of Indian scholars and learn the true meaning of what our ancient sages and philosophers taught, but I don't think that the recommendation of the Commission for making Sanskrit compulsory in the Secondary Schools is at all consonant with the trend of

life at present. The Commission has said that it is possible to teach four languages at the School stage without unduly burdening the students with linguistic studies but it has to be remembered that other subjects have to be learnt in addition to the languages. They must learn history, geography, mathematics, something of science and so on. Unfortunately we are paying little attention to the fact that these subjects are fundamental in our Secondary Schools to-day. History and geography have all been compressed into what is known as social studies now which is neither history nor geography. It might have been good enough for students learning science who have no opportunity of learning history or geography. But it should be a matter of deep concern to us that students on the arts side should be expected to accept the so-called social studies as a substitute for the study of history and geography.

Have I exceeded my time?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Yes, you have.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Just one word more. While I do not agree with the views of the Commission with regard to the compulsory teaching of Sanskrit in schools, I do urge Government to pay early attention to the recommendations that the Commission has made for the advance of Sanskrit studies and Sanskrit research. I am particularly in favour of helping those non-official institutes which have borne for a long time the burden of carrying on research work in Sanskrit studies and in Indology. These institutions deserve a word of praise from us and I think the time has come when Government should help them generously as recommended by the Commission. I am also in favour of a Central Institute of Indology. Its importance cannot be emphasised too much. But I am not in favour of the establishing of a Sanskrit university in every State. Even if the Sanskrit

universities, the establishing of which has been recommended by the Commission, are to be the apex of the Pathshalas, I think one or two universities in the country will be enough for the purpose. It is not necessary to multiply their number to produce scholars of the old type who will, if I may say so without disrespect, be misfits at the present time.

I am grateful to you and as I have already exceeded my time, I do not want to say anything more now, though there is a lot more to say. I am only grateful to you for allowing me this much time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRIT): Yes, this time-limit is a great handicap to everyone.

श्री अनोल्लख चंद : माननीय उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इतने विवाद के बाद मेरी तो कुछ ऐसी धारणा होने लगी है कि शायद सरकार के लिये इन सुझावों को, जो कि एक अच्छे विचार से दिये गये हैं, मानना सम्भव न हो। किन्तु मैं यह अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रत्येक भारतीय नर नारी के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि वह संस्कृत को जाने; अब यह कि किस तरह से जाने, कैसे जाने, यह सब विद्वानों का कार्य है। उन लोगों ने कुछ सुझाव दिये हैं और उस पर कुछ मतभेद प्रकट किया गया है लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि कोई बालक बचपन से ही चाणक्य नीति, हितोपदेश, पंचतंत्र आदि ग्रन्थों का अध्ययन कर पाये, तो सम्भवतः वह अधिक उपयोगी नागरिक होगा। मैंने संस्कृत का विशेष अध्ययन नहीं किया, मैं कुछ ज्यादा जानता नहीं, लेकिन यह जरूर है कि काशी में रहने के नाते कुछ उसकी जानकारी रखता हूँ।

जैसा कि यह कहा गया है कि संकीर्ण विचार के लोगों ने यह विवरण दिया है, यह शायद उनके साथ अन्याय है। वह चाहे कोई

भी हों। “वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्” यह एक प्राचीन पद्धति कहिये, या हमारी संस्कृति का आधार कहिये, उसकी जो भी जानकारी रखता है वह संकुचित विचारों का न होगा। जैसा कि श्री राम सहाय जी ने कहा अर्थ, कर्म, मोक्ष, यह तो ठीक है। लेकिन दर्शन, ज्ञान और चारित्र्य, ये सब ऐसी चीजें हैं जो प्रत्येक भारतीय नर नारी में होनी चाहिये। अगर आप यह चाहते हैं कि भारतीय संस्कृति आज दुनिया से उठ जाय, वही किया जाय जो आज तक किया गया है कि संस्कृत के अध्ययन करने के लिये जर्मनी में विद्यार्थियों को भेजा जाय, तो मैं आप से कहूंगा कि यह हमारे देश के लिए एक अशुभ दिन होगा। इस समय आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हमारे प्रत्येक प्रदेश में कम से कम एक संस्कृत यूनिवर्सिटी हो, एक संस्कृत विद्यालय हो। मैं इस विषय में ज्यादा नहीं जानता किन्तु जिन बुजुर्गों ने, जिन साहित्य के विद्वानों ने आज सदन में इस वाद-विवाद में भाग लिया है, वे शायद जानते होंगे, लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि काशी में जो संस्कृत कालेज है, जिस पर उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने डा० भगवानदास की एक कमेटी बनाई थी, उसने बताया कि किस तरह से यह जो पुरानी पद्धति संस्कृत शिक्षा की है—जिसमें प्रथमा, मध्यमा, शास्त्री, आदि अनेक डिग्रियों की परीक्षाएं होती थीं, उनके पास करने वालों को अर्थकरी का अवसर दिया जाय और यह कि भूगोल, इतिहास वगैरह प्रत्येक को जानना चाहिये। जहां हिन्दी की परीक्षाओं को पास करने के बाद अंग्रेजी का ज्ञान होने से एडमिशन या मैट्रिकुलेशन का सर्टिफिकेट मिल जाता है, वैसे ही संस्कृत की परीक्षाओं को पास करने के बाद अंग्रेजी का इम्तहान देने पर उसी प्रकार उन को सुविधा मिलनी चाहिये। मेरे पास समय नहीं है किन्तु इतना कह कर बैठ जाऊंगा कि माननीय मंत्री जी को इस बात का आभार मानना चाहिये कि संस्कृत के विद्वानों ने जो एक चीज उनके सामने रखी है और उस पर आज जो वाद-विवाद हुआ, उसके बाद उसको कोल्ड

[श्री अभोलक चंद]

स्टोरेज "शीत गृह" में न रख दें, बल्कि जहां तक हो सके उसके लिये कुछ ऐसा करें जिसमें हर भारतीय बालक का चरित्र ऊंचा हो और उसको अनुशासन में रहने की शिक्षा मिले। आज आप विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासनहीनता देखते हैं। आप उन विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासनहीनता तो देखिये, जिन्होंने अपनी शिक्षा संस्कृत के माध्यम से पाई है? क्या वे भी ऐसे ही हैं? इसलिये मैं कहता हूं कि अगर आप अनुशासित और उपयुक्त भारतीय नागरिक देखना चाहते हैं तो आप सब संकोचों को छोड़ कर संस्कृत की पढ़ाई की ओर ज्यादा से ज्यादा ध्यान दें।

श्री त्रिम्बक दामोदर पुस्तके (मध्य प्रदेश): उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, संस्कृत के बारे में काफी कहा गया है और अब उसकी तारीफ करने की जरूरत नहीं है। यहां यह कहा गया है कि "Sanskrit Commission was leaded with Sanskrit Scholars". मैं

नहीं समझता कि संस्कृत कमीशन में मैं संस्कृत जानने वालों के बजाय उसमें मैकाले की जरूरत थी। एक बात कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में यह भी कही गई है कि संस्कृत पापुलर लैंग्वेज नहीं है। पापुलर शब्द के दो मतलब होते हैं। एक तो यह है कि लोगों का उसमें विश्वास हो, लोग उसको चाहते हों और एक यह कि सब लोग, अबाम उसे बोलते हों। यह कोई नहीं कह सकता है कि संस्कृत दूसरे सेंस में पापुलर थी। पहले सेंस में इस देश में संस्कृत एक सिरे से दूसरे सिरे तक पापुलर थी। हर शख्स यह चाहता था कि संस्कृत का थोड़ा बहुत ज्ञान उसे मिले, संस्कृत की थोड़ी बहुत जानकारी उसे हो और संस्कृत ग्रन्थों में जो लिखा है, मिल सके।

श्री राम सहाय जी जो यह मोशन लाये हैं, उसके लिये मैं उनको धन्यवाद दूंगा किन्तु डा० बालिंगे जी ने इस सम्बन्ध में जो कुछ कहा है, उसके बारे में मैं यह कहूंगा कि इस काम के लिये बहुत थोड़ा समय दिया गया है।

यह एक बहुत बड़ा विषय था, इसके लिये काफी समय दिया जाना चाहिये था।

स्वामी वेवेका नन्द जी ने "इंडिया एण्ड हर प्राब्लम" नामक पुस्तक लिखी है। उन्होंने उसमें यह लिखा है कि राष्ट्रीय शिक्षा की कितनी आवश्यकता होती है। उन्होंने अपनी किताब में यह लिखा है कि हमारी कमजोरी क्या है और उसे कैसे दूर किया जा सकता है। इस सम्बन्ध में इस किताब में काफी तफसील के साथ उन्होंने लिखा है। उसमें उन्होंने लिखा है कि हम में इनफीरियरिटी काम्प्लेक्स आ गया है और उसको हमें हटाना आवश्यक है। यह बात उन्होंने खास कर लिखी है। मैकाले ने हमारी शिक्षा को एक ही बात के लिये नष्ट किया और वह यह है कि हम में इनफीरियरिटी काम्प्लेक्स आ जाय। जस्टिस उडराक ने एक छोटी सी किताब "Is India Civilised" लिखी है। एक पादरी ने ऐसा लिखा था "India is half barbarous, half civilised" उसका जवाब उस किताब में जस्टिस उडराक ने दिया है और उसमें ऐसा लिखा है कि अंग्रेजों ने हिन्दुस्तान को तलवार के भरोसे पर जीतने के बजाय उसके कल्चर को दबाने की कोशिश की है और उसमें उनको कामयाबी मिली है और इसलिये वह हिन्दुस्तान के मालिक बन सके हैं। तो यह जो कमी यहां आ गई है उसको पूरा करना है, उसको दूर करना है और इसलिये हमको संस्कृत को पापुलर बनाना है, उसको इनकरेज करना है। हमारे यहां हिन्दुस्तान में पेशवाओं ने संस्कृत के ज्ञान को बढ़ाया। उन्होंने ऐसा कोई सरक्युलर तो नहीं निकाला था कि हर एक आदमी को संस्कृत जाननी चाहिये, लेकिन जो संस्कृत में पांडित हो जाते थे, जो संस्कृत ज्ञान के भंडार बन जाते थे और उसका प्रचार करते थे, उनको वे बख्शीश देते थे, उनको वे दक्षिणा देते थे। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि ऐसा ही कोई तरीका यहां किया जाय, बल्कि मैं एक उदाहरण दे रहा हूं कि जब हमको

किसी चीज को तरक्की देनी होती है तो उसके लिये कुछ खास सूरतें पैदा करनी होती हैं। मैं स्वामी विवेकानन्द जी के कहने के मुताबिक या महर्षि दयानन्द जी के कहने के मुताबिक यह कह रहा हूँ, ऐसा नहीं है, बल्कि आचार्य विनोबा जी इस बात को कह रहे हैं कि हमें देश में मैटिरियलिज्म को लाना है क्योंकि हम झुके नहीं रहना चाहते हैं, कोई भूखे पेट राम नाम नहीं भज सकता है, हमारे देश से गरीबी जानी चाहिये और इस माने में हम को मैटिरियलिज्म को लाना है, लेकिन केवल मैटिरियलिज्म को ला कर और वैस्टर्न मैटिरियलिज्म को ला कर आज देश का उद्धार होने वाला नहीं है और हमें उस के साथ स्पिरिचुअलिज्म भी लाना चाहिये।

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Has this got anything to do with the Report of the Sanskrit Commission?

श्री त्रिम्बक दामोदर पुस्तके : और स्पिरिचुअलिज्म का कोई बड़ा भंडार कहीं है तो वह संस्कृत में है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : He is saying that Sanskrit is the reservoir.

श्री त्रिम्बक दामोदर पुस्तके : तो उस संस्कृत को तरक्की देने के लिये हमें बहुत सो बातें करनी हैं। आज हम एटामिकपावर के लिये जगह जगह रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट्स कायम कर रहे हैं—मैं उसके लिये बड़ी धन्यता मानता हूँ—तो इसी तरह से संस्कृत लैंग्वेज के बारे में रिसर्च करने के लिये भी उतनी ही मेहनत से काम करना चाहिये और उस को तरक्की देनी चाहिये। जब मैटिरियलिज्म और स्पिरिचुअलिज्म दोनों साथ साथ चलेंगे तभी कुछ फायदा होगा।

मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ। मुझे एक ही बात कहनी है कि हम इस बात पर

ज्यादा जोर देते हैं कि हम को संस्कृत कमीशन की फलानी रिक्मेंडेशन मंजूर है या नहीं, परन्तु हमें असली चीज यह देखी है कि हम किस तरह से संस्कृत को ज्यादा पापुलर बना सकेंगे और किस तरह से जल्दी उस को पूरे महत्व का स्थान दे सकेंगे। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Mrs. Ramamurti. You will get five minutes because Mr. Yajee has to be accommodated. Then I will ask the Minister to speak.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, may I know whether my name is on the list?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Your name is not on the list.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, permit me at this stage to enter my emphatic protest against the manner in which some of us are shabbily treated even by the Secretariat. I was the second person day before yesterday to give my name to the Secretary. When I gave my name for inclusion to the Secretary, I asked as to how many other people's names were there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You may make the complaint to the Chairman or to the Deputy Chairman. I have not got anything to do with it.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I will, but I seek the co-operation and sympathy of the House in this protest of mine. I was the second man to give my name and I do not find my name at all.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : I cannot allow any discussion on that point. The names put down in the list are here and this list does not contain your name.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: True, Sir; my submission is not with

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.] a view to getting permission from you to speak. My object is to bring to the notice of the House how some things sometimes are done.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): He may be allowed, Sir. There may be no bar.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I will ask Shri Kapoor to speak.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI (Madras): I am happy that this opportunity has been given to me to speak on this very important subject namely, the place of Sanskrit and the encouragement it should receive from all quarters for further research and advance, for the creation of a Chair in all Universities and of one or two Central Universities and for restoration of all that is best in this language of culture and tradition in our country. Sanskrit is the mother of most civilised tongues. Sanskrit is at the root of many of the languages and our international contact, our unifying influence, is due to this language. When we meet people from other climes, it is through this root we come to understand each other. In understanding and even learning words like matha, pitha, etc., we form common links and promote intercourse and exchange between people.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Bratha also.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: I can enumerate any number of words like that. While travelling from south to north, east to west, in our own country, we are able to understand to a certain degree the conversation that is going on in the trains and in our social intercourse through our knowledge of the root in Sanskrit. While under a previous foreign rule when Sanskrit had been placed at a very high pedestal, when the whole Universe had been singing the praise of this

language, that at this stage after 10 years of Independence we should discuss even the place of Sanskrit in our educational curriculum is a thing that I do not understand. I do not know, Sir, how the Education Minister is going to plan and administer the continuation of Sanskrit, but I plead that the inculcation of Sanskrit studies right from the lowest age to the highest reach of University knowledge is vital in any scheme of Education. I would plead, Sir, that the number of languages is another matter but this vital language that has come to us through the ancient past, which has transmitted to us all that is best in culture and tradition should be preserved and continued. Friends on the other side talked about men well-versed in Sanskrit but they left out women. Women, Sir, had been the conservers of all that is great—moral and spiritual in values—in the Vedas, the Ramayana and the Mahabharata by word of mouth. Men came and men went; regimes came and regimes went; governance came and went but this rock of knowledge, tradition and culture that is embedded in Sanskrit could never be demolished and, therefore, I say that in this age when we have gained independence it is our duty to see that an environment is created for Sanskrit studies to be started very early, to be promoted in the high school stage and continued in the Universities. I really do not know why my hon. friend over there who is the embodiment of all that is knowledge, said that the study of four languages in the high schools is not possible in this country. Look at children in Delhi, children who have come from different parts of India. Older people like us may find it difficult to learn a language and we go slowly but our children are quite conversant with different languages) and they can talk very easily and freely in four languages, perhaps even five. That being so, why should this be a stumbling block that children cannot learn four languages? Unless you make the study of Sanskrit compulsory right from the beginning in

all stages of school. I am afraid nothing much will be done. Making it optional would spoil the whole thing. Optional means, especially . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I am sorry you have exceeded your time.

SHBIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: . . . now, that it will be governed by considerations of livelihood. The demands of life call for the learning as the means to earn a livelihood. Let Hindi become the national language by all means, in fact the thing is that if you make Sanskrit only optional, it does not help the promotion of this language. I am glad that you gave me this opportunity and I hope all efforts will be made in the direction of making Sanskrit compulsory in Schools which will help simplify the learning of Hindi.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I hope I will have ten minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I will give you ten minutes.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I was to call upon the Minister at 5-30 but with the permission of the House we will sit a little longer, but I must give you ten minutes.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I am very much obliged to you, Sir, for accommodating me even at the inconvenience of sitting a little longer.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I must confess that I felt a little disappointed at the trend the debate has taken on this important subject and, frankly speaking, I was not prepared for this dis-134 RSD—6.

appointment, because I think the subject of the Report of the Sanskrit Commission is of great national importance and I am strongly of the view that if most of the recommendations of this Commission are accepted and adopted we shall have a great cultural renaissance in the country, and what is more, we shall be able then to face the character crisis that has overtaken the country and we shall also be able to bring about the cultural and linguistic integration of the country.

Sir, the first objection that has been raised against this Report relates to the composition of the Commission. As my hon. friend, Mr. Pustake, said, if we look at the terms of reference of the Commission it would have been idle to expect those who are not well versed in Sanskrit to be appointed as members of this Commission. Sir, do we expect that a mathematician should be there?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): But I know some mathematicians who are exceptionally good Sanskrit scholars.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Yes, possible. And in that event they would have brought to bear upon the subject their knowledge of Sanskrit and not their knowledge of mathematics. Possibly that mathematician member would have very accurately counted the number of Pathasalas and the number of Sanskrit schools and colleges in the country, but so far as the merit of the subject is concerned, only his Sanskrit knowledge would have been of avail to him.

Let alone the question of the members of the Commission; we should not forget that they have examined a very large number of persons; they have considered representations from a very large number of institutions and among the persons examined are many High Court Judges, sitting as also ex-Judges, many eminent lawyers

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.] like Shri C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Dr. Katju and others, Chief Ministers of several States like Bombay, Punjab —no, it was the Education Minister of Punjab who was examined—and many other Ministers, Directors of Education of various States, and Vice-Chancellors of many Universities. Therefore, Sir, before the Commission they had material, evidence and views of all sorts of eminent scholars in the country and it is after having considered all their views carefully that they have formulated their recommendations. I do not think therefore there can be any legitimate grievance against the composition of the Commission or against the contents of the Report.

Sir, I am entirely in agreement with the views of the Commission as expressed on page 278 para 2:

"This Report, we are happy to state, reflects the opinion of the Indian Public in connection with the various aspects of Sanskrit Education and Research. The views and recommendations put forward in this Report are really the views and recommendations of the people of India as a whole."

Hon. Members—may be some of them—may differ from this view but if we go about the country and ask the people in general we shall draw only one conclusion from our talk with them that they are all in agreement generally speaking with the views of the Commission and with their recommendations.

Sir, I must at this stage express a little disappointment at the manner in which the Government has so far dealt with this Report. Firstly, they themselves did not place it before us for our consideration and secondly there was an elementary recommendation which the Commission made that the Government should publish a Sanskrit version of this Report—if not the full Report at least .

an abridged summary of it—and for valid reasons which they themselves have given in the Report. And that is, about 40 per cent, of the replies that they have received to the questionnaire which they issued were in Sanskrit and that many witnesses were such as did not know English at all. Now, it is unfair to those witnesses that after having examined them, they should not have the opportunity even to know what the recommendations of the Commission are.

Now, Sir, one thing has been said that the Report of the Commission has been a unanimous one because all the members of the Commission were Sanskrit scholars. True, that is so, but should we not on that account give greater attention and greater weight to the recommendations of this Commission? No doubt we are accustomed to having Reports with a number of minutes of dissent, but I think we should express our unqualified appreciation of the manner in which the members of the Commission have brought to bear on their task their great ability. They have put in very hard labour and if they had come to unanimous decisions it is because they have been able to look at the whole thing with a broad and national outlook except for one thing that they have occasionally expressed an anti-Hindi bias. Even that they could not express on many occasions because if they had done it, they would have taken away the very foundation of their recommendations.

And what are their recommendations, Sir? Sanskrit should be made compulsory; with that I am entirely in agreement. Other hon. Members have expressed great dissatisfaction with that view. They say that so far the Government has suggested a three-language formula, Hindi, mother-tongue and English. Now, they have suggested as a second alternative that Sanskrit also should be added. My submission is that if we accept this suggestion of theirs we shall not be adding the burden of one

more language but as a matter of fact we shall be reducing the burden and converting the four languages into two as it were. My view is—and I think hon. Members will agree with me if they coolly and carefully consider the question—that Sanskrit being the basis of all the Indian languages, if there is a good grounding in Sanskrit at the earliest stage, it will be easy for the child to learn both Hindi and the mother-tongue, if it is not Hindi, and the other language of course will be English. So my submission is, if we look at the problem in this way, we will come to the conclusion that if Sanskrit is taught compulsorily at the earliest stage, Hindi will automatically be learnt at least to the extent of 50 per cent, and the other mother-tongue, if it is not Hindi, will also be learnt to the extent of 50 per cent, automatically. That being so, I submit that the three-language formula will ultimately be reduced to two-language formula. We have to consider the question a little coolly, a little dispassionately, and we should not run away with the idea that adding Sanskrit as a fourth language will be an extra burden. So far as the attitude of the public is concerned, the Commission have on page 65, para. 94, very ably and admirably stated what it is. I have no time at my disposal to read it here but I would like such hon. Members as are interested in it to read paragraph 94 and they will then come to the conclusion that the overwhelming majority of public opinion is in favour of introducing Sanskrit as a compulsory subject even at the earliest stage.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The time limit has been exceeded.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I am just coming to a close. My one important argument in support of the conclusions of the Sanskrit Commis-

sion is that today we find a linguistic fissiparous tendency all over the country. That is a very important political consideration, a very important national consideration which we should not lose sight of. Remember, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that during the course of the discussions in the Constituent Assembly on the question of the official language, at one stage there was a proposal that Sanskrit should be the official language, though for obvious reasons that could not be accepted. Even an eminent and realistic person like Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee once told me very seriously that we should try to work hard to canvass public opinion in the Constituent Assembly for Sanskrit being adopted. Now, that could not be. But then that shows that if we move towards Sanskrit, we shall bring about linguistic integrity all over the country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You have made your point.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Last sentence. But then we could not agree to that. We adopted Hindi with Sanskrit as its basis as the official language merely for the reason that Sanskritised Hindi was the nearest approach to Sanskrit. Let us not, therefore, I would humbly and respectfully submit, forget all the history as to the manner in which Hindi with Sanskrit basis was adopted as the official language. And what the Commission has suggested is very much in the nature of the suggestion which was debated in the Constituent Assembly. Only there is a slight difference of degree. I would submit that we must push up Sanskritised Hindi to the farthest possible extent as the first step towards our ultimate goal of Sanskrit, if ever we can have it.

Thank you once again.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Very few words, Mr. Yajee.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, संस्कृत कमीशन की बहुत सी बातों को स्वीकार करने के लिये मैं तैयार नहीं हूँ। संस्कृत सब के लिये लाजिमी विषय रखा जाय, इस के बजाय मैं चाहता हूँ कि संस्कृत को आप्शनल यानी वैकल्पिक सब्जेक्ट के तौर पर रखा जाये, यद्यपि मैं जानता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के जितने रीति-रिवाज और धार्मिक कृत्य होने हैं, उन में सभी प्रांतों के लोग संस्कृत भाषा का प्रयोग करते हैं। जब से बच्चा पैदा होता है, उस घड़ी से ले कर मुंडन के छवसर तक संस्कृत में ही मंत्रादि का पाठ किया जाता है, शादी होती है, तब संस्कृत में मंत्र पढ़े जाते हैं और जब कोई हिन्दू मर जाता है, तो मरण से लेकर श्मशान घाट ले जाने तक और बाद में धाड़ किया आदि कर्मों के करते वक़्त भी संस्कृत भाषा चलती है। जहाँ तक संस्कृत भाषा का संबंध है, मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की जो बारह, तेरह रीजनल भाषायें हैं, वे सब उसी एक भाषा की लड़कियाँ हैं जो कि सभी हिन्दुस्तान की राष्ट्रीय भाषायें हैं। मेरा तो ऐसा ख्याल है कि जो लोग यह समझते हैं कि संस्कृत भाषा मृतक भाषा है, वे स्वयं मृतक तुल्य हैं। संस्कृत विद्वत् की बड़ी से बड़ी भाषाओं, जैसे लेटिन है, पर्सियन है, अरेबिक है, यह सब की जननी है। पितृ, पैटर, पैदर्स मातृ, मेटर, मदर ये सब संस्कृत के ही कूट्स से ही निकले हैं। मैं समझता हूँ संस्कृत के ज्ञान से सभी भाषाओं का ज्ञान होना सरल हो सकता है। जब भाषा के विषय में मर्दम-शुमारी हुई थी तो ५४,००० आदमियों ने लिखाया था कि संस्कृत हमारी मातृभाषा है। मैं कहता हूँ कि जब तक कोई आदमी संस्कृत नहीं पढ़ेगा, तब तक हिन्दुस्तान में जितनी भाषायें बोली जाती हैं उन का उच्चारण शुद्ध नहीं कर सकता। इसलिये संस्कृत का ज्ञान होना परमावश्यक है क्योंकि उस के बिना शुद्ध शुद्ध उच्चारण भी नहीं हो सकता। जिस तरह से संस्कृत को लाजिमी करने की आवाज़ माननीय सदस्य उठा रहे हैं, मैं नहीं

समझता यह हो सकता है, लेकिन वैकल्पिक भाषा उस को हम मान सकते हैं। संस्कृत भाषा के बारे में यह कहना कि मृत भाषा है, यह बहुत अनुचित है, यह हमारी प्राचीन संस्कृति को जानने का आधार है। पंडित नेहरू ने भी बम्बई में कहा था कि यदि देश की संस्कृति तथा राजनैतिक एकता को कोई चीज़ बनाये रख सकती है तो वह संस्कृत भाषा है। इसलिये दुनिया की भाषाओं की जो जननी है, उसको मृतभाषा कभी कोई सदस्य न कहे। एक हमारे माननीय सदस्य प्रसाद राव जी हैं, जो सात वर्ष तक संस्कृत पढ़े हैं, फिर भी संस्कृत का विरोध करते हैं। संस्कृत का समर्थन करते हुए भी मैं इस ख्याल का नहीं हूँ कि इस को लाजिमी विषय रखा जाये, हाँ, इसको आप्शनल रखने के पक्ष में मैं जरूर हूँ। संस्कृत को आप्शनल विषय रख कर हम संस्कृत का प्रचार कर सकेंगे, इसकी उन्नति कर सकेंगे और उस के द्वारा अपने देश की और देश की संस्कृति की उन्नति करेंगे। मैंने देखा है, जब मुंडन होता है, शादी होती है, उस समय जो मंत्रों का उच्चारण होता है, वह बिल्कुल असुद्ध उच्चारण पंडित लोग बोलते हैं, वे तोते की तरह रटे होते हैं। इसलिये संस्कृत का ठीक ढंग से पढ़ाया जाना निहायत जरूरी

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DH. K. L. SHRIMALI): Mr. Vice-Chairman, in my opinion, the Sanskrit Commission has rendered a great service to the country by focusing our attention on one of the most important problems of our educational system. At this time, when we are advancing towards science and technology there is a fear that we may lose sight of those spiritual and cultural values for which the Indian civilization has stood for thousands of years. While we cannot and should not ignore science and technology, we should continue to keep an eye on those moral and spiritual values for which our civilization has stood. A country

like ours, which has its roots deep into centuries of civilization, cannot afford to lose sight of these values. From that point of view, I think the Sanskrit Commission has rendered a distinct service. Sanskrit symbolises all the moral and spiritual values of our civilization. It is the repository of all our cultural heritage and if we want to preserve the cultural heritage, as we should in our educational system, we cannot afford to ignore Sanskrit studies. So, from that point of view sometimes the Commission may have emphasised one aspect and in emphasising one aspect it may have ignored the other aspects, and may not have fully taken into account the needs of our modern society. But I have no doubt in my mind that the Commission has been motivated by the highest considerations and they have continuously kept before them the cultural heritage of this country. Sir, I would not take up the time of the House by stressing the need for the study of Sanskrit, because that has been fully done in the Commission's Report and also by the various hon. Members.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Does the Government agree with it?

Dr. K. L. SHRIMALI: I think the House would be interested to know what we have done with regard to the recommendations of the Commission. The important recommendation which the Commission made was with regard to the language formula. Now, I would like to remind the House that the three-language formula which was adopted by the Central Advisory Board after very careful consideration makes provision for the study of Sanskrit either on an optional basis as a separate subject or as part of the composite course. If any of the State Governments would like to have Sanskrit as composite course, they could easily have it under this language formula. This matter was considered very carefully by the Central Advisory Board at its last meeting and it came to the conclusion

that in view of this provision which already exists in the three-language formula, it would not be desirable to disturb the three-language formula at this stage. The Central Advisory Board . . .

"Srar H. P. SAKSENA: What are the three languages' of the formula?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I would refer the hon. Member to the proceedings of the Central Advisory Board. The formula is that by the time a student leaves high school or completes his secondary education, he must have an adequate knowledge of his mother-tongue or regional language; he must have an adequate knowledge of Hindi, which is the official language, for the non-Hindi-speaking States and another Indian language for those which are Hindi-speaking States and thirdly, English which is an international language and we need it for university education. This three-language formula was arrived at after very careful consideration, and since this already makes provision for the composite course of Sanskrit with Hindi or the regional language, it was not considered necessary to change and disturb this three-language formula. I would, however, like to say that the Board was convinced that Sanskrit has great importance both- from the cultural and linguistic points of view. It recognised that it has great cultural value; it also recognised that it is a great cementing factor for our various linguistic groups, because many of our languages are derived from Sanskrit, it is the mother of many of our languages.

Then, with regard to the other recommendation that the Sanskrit Commission has made, that the Government should set up a Central Sanskrit Board to advise it as to what steps should be taken to promote Sanskrit studies and to implement the recommendations of the Sanskrit Commission, this matter is receiving the attention of the Government and within a few days, I hope to announce the

TDr, K. L. Shrimali.] decision of the Government in this matter.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Are you agreeing with the suggestion?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am in general sympathy with that suggestion.

The Commission has also recommended that since sources of private charity are drying up, the Government should give financial assistance to important voluntary organisations and academies of Sanskrit. That point was also raised by Dr. Kunzru. I am glad to inform the House that Government has already started giving assistance to voluntary organisations which are propagating Sanskrit and are conducting Sanskrit research, and I hope, in course of time, it will be able to give grants to a large number of organisations.

Another important recommendation which was made by the Commission was with regard to a uniform system for the whole of India with regard to the duration of courses, examinations and nomenclature for degrees and diplomas. Now, the implementation of this recommendation necessitated reference to the State Governments and universities and several important private organisations. We also issued a Press Note and in response to that, replies from 18 State Governments and 26 universities have already been received, and the remaining State Governments and universities have been reminded. Sixteen private organisations have submitted applications for the recognition of their diplomas and degrees in response to our Press Note. As soon as we receive replies from all the universities and State Governments, I propose to set up a Committee to go into this question so that Sanskrit studies and Sanskrit examinations might be standardised.

There are other recommendations dealing with Sanskrit teachers and also to find out whether there are any

institutions which are languishing on account of withdrawal of grants from Princes and other zamindars and also with regard to the creation of endowments which can be available in the interest and the furtherance of Sanskrit studies. My Ministry is in touch with the State Governments and we are collecting the necessary data. As soon as the necessary data are available, the recommendations of the Sanskrit Commission will be implemented.

In this way, it will be seen that the Ministry of Education has not slept over the recommendations of the Sanskrit Commission. As soon as the Report came to us, we began examining its recommendations and we have started implementing some of them. The task which is before us, is, however, of great magnitude . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Stupendous

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: ... and it will require the co-operation of the State Governments and the universities, and I do hope that with their co-operation we shall be able to promote Sanskrit studies and Sanskrit research and to find a proper place for Sanskrit studies in the educational system of India.

Sir, I have nothing more to add. I can assure the House that it will be my earnest effort to implement as many recommendations of this Commission as possible.

Thank you. ,

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Just one point, Sir. One of the suggestions made by the Commission is that the Government should think of bringing in legislation to the effect that our valuable manuscripts are not exported. Has the Government applied its mind to this suggestion, and if so, what is its conclusion?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: This is with regard to manuscripts. The Indian

Historical Records Commission considered the question as to what could be done to acquire all the manuscripts which are in the hands of private people, in the hands of certain agencies. Now, there is no law in the land which we could enforce and with which we could acquire all these manuscripts and the Indian Historical Records Commission has suggested that a Committee should be appointed to go into this question, and I am hoping that their Committee would soon be appointed to look into this matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : Mr. Ram Sahai. We have got only two minutes more, but if the House agrees, we can sit for a few minutes longer.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

श्री राम सहाय : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे थोड़ा सा जवाब देना है। मैं अपनी बात संक्षेप में ही कहने की कोशिश करूंगा। यहां अभी एक यह ख्याल जाहिर किया गया कि संस्कृत कामनमेन की लैंग्वेज नहीं रही है और एक यह कहा गया है कि यह इम्प्रेविट-केबिल चीज है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि आज से हजार वर्ष पहले जब कि मुस्लिम रूलर्स यहां नहीं आये थे या यहां नहीं थे, तब हम कौन सी भाषा सीखते थे और हमारे जितने पढ़ने वाले होते थे वे कौन सी भाषा पढ़ते थे। हमारे यहां का जो इतिहास लिखा जाता था वह कौन सी भाषा में लिखा जाता था, हमारे यहां जो ड्रामाज होते थे वे कौन सी भाषा में होते थे ? इन बातों को भी जाने दीजिये, हमारे यहां जो संस्कार होते थे, गर्भाधान से लेकर अंत्येष्टि तक जो १६ संस्कार होते थे, वे किस भाषा के द्वारा होते थे ? हमारे यहां जो कथा-भागवत होती थी, वह किस भाषा में होती थी ? हमारे यहां जब बच्चा उत्पन्न होता था, तब उस की जबान पर शहद से "ओम" लिखने का एक संस्कार था। तो जब इस प्रकार की संस्कृति होती थी और जब इस प्रकार वातावरण में हम रहते थे

तब उस वातावरण में संस्कृत का स्थान था और संस्कृत की उन्नति थी। आज 6 P.M. जब हम विदेशों में जा कर तालीम पायें, शिक्षा पायें और विदेशी नर्सों की गोद में पलें और पोसे जायें और जीवन का सारा वातावरण अंग्रेजी भाषा में गुजर जाय, जिस से अंग्रेजी भाषा अच्छी तरह से सीख सकें और फिर हम संस्कृति की बात करें, यह इम्प्रेविट-केबिल है। यह अजीब सी बात है, जो मेरी समझ में नहीं आती।

श्री अमोलक चन्द : नर्सों की गोद में पले हैं ?

श्री राम सहाय : यही तो निवेदन है। जरा आप इस बात पर विचार करें कि जहां पहले हमारे जीवन के प्रत्येक अंग में संस्कृत का बराबर व्यवहार होता था, पंडित लोग हमारे यहां थे, वे संस्कृत में पूजा करते थे, लोग मन्दिरों में जाते थे तो आरती उतारते वक्त संस्कृत का उच्चारण करते थे, नित्य सायंकाल प्रातःकाल सन्ध्या करते थे। यह सब किस भाषा में करते थे, संस्कृत में ? हमारे यहां जो ब्राह्मण, क्षत्री, वैश्य होते थे, शूद्रों की बात जाने दीजिये, उन का यज्ञोपवीत होता था और सब कार्यवाही संस्कृत में होती थी। फिर अगर वह संस्कृत भाषा आम तौर पर प्रचलित नहीं थी, तो कौन सी दूसरी भाषा थी जिस के बारे में हम कहें, उसने संस्कृत का स्थान लिया हुआ था ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : In the Catholic Church, all ceremonies are performed in Latin. Does it follow that Latin is the language of Europe?

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Latin was a language.

श्री मा० दा० तुम्पलीवार (मुम्बई) : शूद्रों की भाषा क्या थी, बतलान की कृपा करेंगे ?

श्री राम सहाय : एक और भी चीज मैं आप के सम्मुख निवेदन करता हूं। आज

[श्री राम सहाय]

हमारे हाउसेज में साढ़े सात सौ सदस्यों की संख्या है। हमारे अधिकतर सदस्य इस ख्याल से कि उन की रिपोर्ट अखबार में नहीं आयेगी, यदि वे हिन्दी में बोलेंगे, वे अंग्रेजी में बोलते हैं। वे लोग जब संस्कृत के विषय में शंका करें तो यह एक अनहोनी बात नहीं है। मैं कहता हूँ यह जैनरेशन आज चाहे जो सोचे-समझे, लेकिन भविष्य में जो जैनरेशन आयेगी वह संस्कृत अवश्य अपनायेगी और मैं समझता हूँ कि निकट भविष्य में ही वह जैनरेशन आने वाली है और मैं विश्वास करता हूँ, अवश्य आयेगी।

तो मेरा निवेदन है, इन बातों पर हमें गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करना चाहिये। अभी कमीशन के बारे में जो कहा गया उन्होंने रिपोर्ट ऐसी दी, वैसी दी, यह मैं कहता हूँ कमीशन के साथ अन्याय करना है। उन्होंने कभी इस तरह से, जिस तरह का चर्चा रिपोर्ट के विषय में प्रस्ताव के विरोधी मित्रों ने किया है, अपनी रिपोर्ट में उल्लेख नहीं किया है। उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा है, मैं आप को पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ :

"The Commission urges upon the Government the need for making an adequate provision for the study of Sanskrit in the scheme of general education, in Schools and Colleges, as otherwise the liberalisation of Sanskrit Education which has taken place in modern times will receive an undesirable set-back (III.49).

The Commission recommends that this provision should be such that, in some way or other, the young Indian pupils, with such exceptions as may be necessary (V.15), would automatically study Sanskrit;"

तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि उस में जिस प्रकार का उल्लेख किया गया, उस पर यह बहस करना कि प्रत्येक विद्यार्थी को लाजमी संस्कृत शिक्षण की बात रिपोर्ट में अनिवार्य

रूप से कही गई है, यह गलत बात है। दूसरे, जो चौथी भाषा को मिलाने की बात कही गई है वह भी सही नहीं है। यदि मैं उन सब बातों पर प्रकाश डालूँ जो कमीशन ने कही है तो बहुत समय लगेगा। लेकिन उन्होंने उस शंका की दृष्टि से ही जो शंका यहाँ व्यक्त की जा रही है, अपनी रिपोर्ट में उस का ध्यान रखते हुए चौथी भाषा संस्कृत के विषय में कहा है। मैं समझता हूँ अगर हम रिपोर्ट को अच्छी तरह से स्टडी कर के विचार करेंगे तो गवर्नमेंट को भी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को स्वीकार करने में किसी तरह का पसोपेश नहीं होगा। जैसा मंत्री महोदय ने भी बताया है, उसमें एक खास बात यह है कि बहुत से ट्रस्ट और इंडाक्-मेंट इस वक्त देश में ऐसे हैं जिन के पास बहुत-सा साधन और बहुत-सा धन संस्कृत का अध्ययन करने के लिये हैं। ऐसी शिक्षा संस्थाओं को संस्कृत बोर्ड नियुक्त कर के उस के अधीन कर लेना चाहिये। दूसरे, संस्कृत प्राइवेट पाठशालायें जो इस वक्त चल रही हैं, उनका पुनर्गठन करना चाहिये और उस में हम इंगलिश शिक्षण का प्रयोग कैसे कर सकें, दूसरे विषय जैसे इतिहास है, भूगोल है और दूसरी सामयिक चीजें जैसे साइंस, टेक्नोलोजी इत्यादि हैं, उन का समावेश किस प्रकार कर सकें, विचार करना चाहिये; तभी हम संस्कृत भाषा की प्रतिष्ठा, मान मर्यादा और कल्चरल हेरीटेज, जैसा कि मंत्री महोदय ने अभी कहा, उस को पूर्ण कर सकेंगे। बस इतना ही निवेदन है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The Secretary will read a Message from the Lok Sabha.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1959

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:—