

etc. who are the main purchasers of iron ore from Paradeep Port, are using more than 1 lakh tonne ships instead of small ships as in the past. To accommodate ships of more than 1 lakh tonnes at Paradeep Port, digging to more depth than that of 39' at present and without making up of the construction of very expensive outward port for loading and unloading of shipments, which need be done mechanically in the mid-sea are the main objectives of making Paradeep Port a profitable one.

I would request the hon. Minister for Shipping and Transport to kindly take up this problem so that the port in question may be made a profitable one.

- (xi) Need to reconsider the move of Railway Board to transfer the wagon inspection work from RDSO to RITES

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura) : The Railway Board is contemplating to transfer the inspection agency for wagons manufactured mostly in the private sector from Research, Designs and Standards Organisation (known as RDSO). It is an acknowledged fact that standard of inspection by RDSO is superior because of strong and intimate technical back-up readily available from its design wing whereas M/s RITES do not enjoy this advantage. Numerous complaints from the zonal railways about the poor quality of inspection of Railway Stores by M/s RITES are on records of the Railway Board. It appears the Ministry of Railways have ignored the fact that wagons are very important from safety point of view as amongst the three types of Rolling Stock, wagons contributes the maximum towards mishaps. A Committee of Senior Directors of the Railway Board appointed for this purpose recommended categorically that the inspection of wagons and its safety items should continue to remain with RDSO. The Managing Director, M/s RITES has favoured to maintain status quo. Furthermore, the inspection conducted by RDSO is cheaper than the Railways will have to pay to M/s RITES for the same job. There will be a serious setback to the existing staff of RDSO Wagon Inspection Organisation by way of transfer, pay, seniority and reversions.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We will go to the next item.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani) : Sir, I had submitted my matter for consideration under 377 and I have met the Speaker also. It is a very important subject and during the whole of the session, I have not come forward with any matter under 377. I would therefore make a special request that I may be permitted to make the statement in this House, specially when the Education Minister is also present now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It may be considered tomorrow.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : 'May be' or 'shall be' ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : 'May' will also have the meaning of 'shall' some time.

13.30 hrs.

VISVA-BHARATI (AMENDMENT) BILL

As Passed by Rajya Sabha

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now the House will take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shrimati Sheila Kaul, namely :

"That the Bill further to amend the Vishva-Bharati Act, 1951, as passed by Rajya Sabha be taken into consideration."

Shrimati Sheila Kaul may continue her speech.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRIES OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is significant that we began the consideration of the Visva-Bharati Amendment Bill on the auspicious day of the birth anniversary of Rabindranath Tagore yesterday, the 7th May. I am sure that the present Bill which has been proposed by the Joint Committee of the Parliament and which embodies a refreshing

[Shrimati Sheila Kaul]

effort to restore to this University certain effective means of embodying the original ideas and ideals of Rabindranath Tagore is a fitting offering of the Parliament to the spirit of Rabindranath Tagore. Visva-Bharati symbolizes a living expression of the multifaceted genius of Rabindranath Tagore, and I am sure that you will all agree that Providence has provided us a rare opportunity of assembling here together to pay our humble tribute to Rabindranath Tagore.

Now I am continuing the speech that I started yesterday.

The Joint Committee has further recommended provision of three whole-time directors which I shall explain in some detail. There has been a feeling that Visva-Bharati should be looked upon as one unified institution of education that coordinates the two major aspects, namely, studies promoted in Santiniketan and rural reconstruction promoted in Sriniketan. To emphasis, this coordination of Santiniketan and Sriniketan as also to emphasise the role of Visva-Bharati as a laboratory for educational innovations, the Committee has recommended that there should be a Director who will be designated as Director of Studies, Educational Innovations and Rural Reconstruction. Subject to the provisions of the Act, he will be responsible for executing and expediting decisions regarding studies, educational innovations and academic programmes at Santiniketan as also programmes of rural reconstruction at Sriniketan. And he will be responsible also for fostering a link between the activities of Santiniketan and those at Sriniketan.

Coming now to the aspect of culture, we should ensure that the treasures of Gurudev, whether a drama or of poetry or songs or music or painting, do not remain confined within the precincts of Visva-Bharati. We should create facilities through which these treasures which constitute a precious heritage are increasingly made available to the children and youth of the whole country and even of other countries. We must ask seriously as to why children and youth of our country continue to remain ignorant of the

tremendous contributions that Gurudev made in various fields of education, culture, and life in general. Could we not provide facilities and requisite machinery by means of which children and youth and teachers could come to know more and more of Gurudev's 'Gitanjali', 'The Gardener', 'Lipika', numerous Dramas such as 'Dak Ghar', endless songs of enchanting music, and astonishingly, innovative paintings? To emphasise this aspect of culture, the Committee has recommended for a Director, who will be designated as the Director of Culture and Cultural Relations. Subject to the provisions of the Act, he will act as Head of Rabindra Bhavan and organise teaching and research in ideals and work of Rabindra Nath Tagore, in Indian culture and its relations with the cultures of other countries. He will organise the task of dissemination through various media, including films and video-tapes, of the cultural treasures including those of art, literature and music. In addition, he shall also, under the general supervision of Upacharya, be responsible for relationship with institutions and agencies of culture of India and abroad, and he will have the responsibility of getting the works of Rabindranath Tagore translated in various languages of India and other countries. The Director of Culture and Cultural Relations shall also coordinate the activities of various institutions at Santiniketan and Sriniketan in the matter of culture and cultural relations.

In order to provide a high status to the activities of physical education, sports, students' welfare and national service, there will be a provision for appointment of a Director to be designated as the Director of Physical Education, Sports, National Service and Students' Welfare. He will be responsible for organising programmes and activities of national service, physical education, sports and students' welfare.

Further, the Joint Committee has proposed modification of the compositions of the Samsad, Karma-Samiti and Shiksha-Samiti so as to provide for representations to teachers and students in such a way that electioneering is avoided and due place is given to seniority and merit. The Joint Committee has also recommended an advisory Council for educational innovations to review the

present educational system at Visva-Bharati in the light of the teachings of Rabindra Nath Tagore and to suggest ways and means by which Tagore's ideas and can be embodied therein.

Further, in order to provide an innovative feature in regard to students' consultation on various matters that relate to their growth, development and welfare, the Joint Committee recommended that there should be a Students' Council consisting of Director of Physical Education, Sports, National Service and Students' Welfare as Chairman and all doctorate and post-doctorate students, all students who have won prizes in the fields of studies, fine arts, sports and extension work or any other prizes at the level of Class X and above, and 20 students nominated by the Academic Council on the basis of merit in studies, sports, extra-curricular activities and all-round development of personality. It is further provided that any student of the University belonging to Class X and above shall have the right to bring up any matter concerning the University before the Students' Council, if so permitted by the Chairman, and he shall have the right to participate in the discussion at any meeting when this matter is taken up for consideration.

The function of the Council shall be to make suggestions to appropriate authorities of the University in regard to the programmes of studies, students' welfare and other matter of importance in regard to the working of the University in general. The suggestions would be made on the basis of consensus of opinion.

As I have said at the outset the changes made by the Committee were welcomed by the other House and I recommend the same for consideration and approval of this august House as well.

With these words, I move that the Bill as passed by the Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when the whole country, nay the whole world, is observing this day, the 25th of Baisakha, the birthday of Gurudev

Rabindra Nath Tagore, we are discussing the Bill which, if you permit me to say, is an insult to the lofty ideals of Rabindra Nath Tagore, insult to his memory and insult to Visva-Bharati itself.

Sir, Tagore, having himself suffered from the soulless system of education, wanted to create an atmosphere where the students could develop in freedom, could develop their own mental faculties in freedom and in touch and nature. Basically, he believed in freedom, democracy, in self-expression, unfettered liberty to develop one's mental and physical faculties. Sir, with these lofty ideals he established a school which today is known as 'Shantiniketan', abode of peace, was started only with five pupils whom he was teaching and gradually it became the centre of experimental education based on indigenous and national ideals.

Not only the geographical barriers, but the cultural and intellectual boundaries of the original Ashram were expanded. It took a cosmopolitan character and its horizon expanded.

Sir, in 1921 with the development of our freedom struggle to liberate ourselves from foreign rule, Visva-Bharati attracted the attention of the whole country and in 1921 Visva-Bharati was publicly inaugurated as a national institute with an international outlook, as a centre of learning where the cultures of East and West may meet in a common fellowship.

When Socrates was asked—"Are you a citizen of Athens?" he said—"I am a citizen of the world." Tagore believed in world fellowship. He believed that all the cultures should meet. If you permit me to recite he said in his poem :

*Dibe ar nibe milibe
jube na fire
ai bharater
mahamaneber
Sagar tire*

"It will be the mingling of cultures, mutual give and take and everybody should contribute. Actually here in this university, he invited people from abroad, distinguished

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty]

scholars representing different cultures. He wanted it to be a University of the World, where the mind is without fear, where man will be free and regain himself, where there will be free pursuit of knowledge, that is what he wanted, and all his life he worked for it.

In the beginning life was very simple and austere. It was a spartan life, but with Athenian freedom. The University is for pursuit of knowledge and to know the unknown. That is why he expanded the horizon. It is almost like Ulysses going ahead and going ahead to know more. It does not stop.

After Independence, when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister, Visva-Bharati was declared as an institution of national importance through an Act of Parliament in 1951. Upto 1971, Visva-Bharati was guided by this Act of Parliament. Pandit Nehru promised this House that this Act is not going to take away the liberty, freedom and autonomy of Visva-Bharati. It was to give financial assistance and to preserve and promote the ideals of Visva-Bharati. In 1971, another Act of Parliament completely destroyed the democratic bodies of the University and all the bodies of the University were nominated bodies. Sir, you know what happened during 1970-71 in West Bengal. There was Naxalite Movement and Visva-Bharati was not free from it. Yes ; there were some movements, there was some trouble. But the Government took advantage of it. Taking advantage of it, they deprived the University of its democratic bodies. All were nominated bodies. But then the Government assured that it was a temporary measure, and very soon, another Act would replace the 1971 Act and democracy would be restored.

In 1978, when Mr. P.C. Chunder was the Education Minister, he introduced a Bill in the Rajya Sabha. There also, there was an attempt at bureaucratization, and regimentation. But compared to the present Bill, that was better because there was a provision for elections.

They accuse the Janata Government. But during the time of the Janata Government, they at least made a provision for election of representatives of teachers and students. But, Sir, you will be surprised to see that in the present Bill, this has been totally done away with. There is no election, but instead of nomination, there is rotation on the basis of seniority.

PROF. N.G. RANGA (Guntur) : Is that not better ?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : I am coming to it. I only want that you should try for the best. I would like to know from the Government, because I discuss the different provisions of the Bill, what its attitude is towards the management of Universities and other educational institutions. They should clearly say whether they believe in democratic principles or not. If they believe in democracy, participatory democracy, it logically follows that in all institutions, including educational institutions, there should be participatory democracy.

AN HON. MEMBER : Including the State of West Bengal.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : I am coming to that. There, there is the greatest expansion of democracy.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat) . What is permissible, of course.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : It is a cruel joke that the Government says that they are against democratic principles, because democracy generates conflict. The same argument was advanced in Pakistan when the military dictator was asked : "Why is there no vote in Pakistan ?" He replied : "Well, you know now everything is peaceful. The moment there is vote, there will be conflict." Is this the argument that a Government which at least proclaims democracy, should advance ? Democracy means choice. And the choice would surely mean conflict of ideas. What do you mean when you say there will be conflict ? In a free society, in a democratic

society, there should be conflict of ideals, and of principles. And the people must choose from out of these conflicting ideas and principles, which ever, according to an individual, is the best. He or she will choose the person representing that particular idea or principle. In educational institutions, where we have educated people, responsible people, there should be more of free play of conflicting ideas. Otherwise, how one would be able to choose it? When I started I said that Rabindranath Tagore believed in free play of ideas both of East and West; he believed in freedom and democracy. Here in this Bill decent burial has been given to the principle of democracy. Why in the name of maintaining peace in the campus?

They have been going on without the elected body right from 1971 upto this day. You have said in your Statement of Objects and Reasons that the standard has been deteriorating. Why? Can you assure me, where there is no election, that university is peaceful? No. It cannot be. If there are conflicts in a society, there will be conflicts in all the institutions including the educational institutions. On page 6 of the Bill, it reads as follows:

“The President of India shall be the Paridarsaka (Visitor) of the University.”

We should decide whether we should associate the political people. When I say, President, the Governor, they are definitely, before they occupy that post, the political leaders. In the case of Visva-Bharati, we have the Prime Minister also as Chancellor. I do not know how it has come. If in West Bengal, we make a provision that the Chief Minister will be the Chancellor of Calcutta University, you will say, everything is gone; it is politics. But what have you done here? I do not mean any disrespect to the Prime Minister. Why is it that the Prime Minister should be the Chancellor and President, the Paridarsaka? Anyway, you have made the President the Paridarsaka. All right. But what is his powers? You will see this is what the President can do. On page 7 of the Bill, it reads as follows:

“Without prejudice to the foregoing

provisions of this section, the Paridarsaka (Visitor) may, by order in writing, annul any proceeding of the University which is not in conformity with this Act, the Statutes or the Ordinances.”

This is the sweeping power given to the Paridarsaka. Even the Samsad (Court), Karma-Samiti (Executive Council), they are packed with nominated people; and there you have done away with elected principle. Then teachers' representatives and others come on rotational basis. But what are the actual powers of these bodies? “Whenever the President feels that any act or action of the University is not in consonance with the Act”—who is going to decide whether this thing is in consonance with the Act or not? Well, the Visitor?

13.55 hrs.

(SHRI R.S. SPARROW *in the Chair*)

And he can annul anything done by the University Body. What does it mean? It means that ultimately the Visitor has the absolute power. Is it not a mockery of democracy? Is it not completely doing away with the autonomy of the University? Even in academic matters the Visitor is supreme. Had it been only in financial matters I could understand something but whenever the Visitor feels like, he can intervene and make all these bodies, which are nominated, ineffective. What does it actually mean? Are you showing any respect to the ideals of Rabindranath Tagore? Tagore, you know, did not make any provision for any member of his family to be in the Governing Body, he was such a democrat. Actually whatever was earned out of his publications, he gave it to Visva-Bharati. He did not make any provision for any of his family members to be in the Governing Body as ex-officio. He wanted it to be done on the basis of democracy, on the basis of understanding. But here in this Bill, this Government is making the Visitor so powerful that all democracy loses its meaning, all participation in decision-making process loses its meaning. I must say, in 1951 Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru promised that the Central Government would not interfere in

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty]

the autonomy of the University, it was only taking the financial responsibility. That is what he promised. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad also promised that the Government will preserve and promote the ideals of the University. But I think the Present Bill is destroying the ideals which Visva-Bharati stood for.

Again, you come to *Acharya*—the Chancellor. How is the Chancellor elected? Well, not by the *Samsad* or the Court but by the Executive Council. It says: "The *Acharya* (Chancellor) shall be appointed by the *Paridarsaka* (Visitor) from out of a panel of persons prepared and recommended by the *Karma-Samiti* (Executive Council) under sub-section (2A)." Why is it that the higher body where there is more representation, though undemocratic, you do not trust the *Samsad* but it is the Executive Council which will make the panel of names and out of that panel, the Visitor would appoint the Council?

I have time and again said that it is very bad that we should expose the Prime Minister to such a position where you will have to face so many things as Chancellor of the university because the Prime Minister becomes one of the officers of the university. I do not find any reason. If you want to make the university really autonomous, the academic people should be the Chancellor.... (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL : The Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi is the Chancellor of Visva-Bharati by virtue of not being the Prime Minister but in her personal capacity she has been elected. She stands there as an elected Chancellor.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : That is true but what I say is that since Pandit Nehru was there, you see who were the Chancellors of Visva-Bharati. You will find most of the time Prime Ministers have occupied this position. But I think if you have to make a provision, you should say the people from the academic community. But you also have said people from the public life. That means you have

made room for the politicians. The Chancellor must be primarily an academic person and he should be chosen from the academic community, not from the people who have this public life.

MR. CHAIRMAN : This is your point of view, I think.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Yes. So, what has been done? Now they are shouting from the house-top everywhere that the educational institutions should be free from political interference. That is for the consumption of the people. But when they make any provision, well their Prime Minister, their people interfere and it becomes non-political. It is a strange logic. I do not know how that will sustain it. The Education Minister will have to reply. But in a subtle way they have done it so that they can control the whole university from Delhi.

I know that your control would mean simply the control by the bureaucracy. You will hear what the bureaucracy will want you to hear. You will do what the bureaucrats will want you to do. That is these powers are going to strengthen the bureaucracy, which means regimentation, against which Rabindranath Tagore fought all his life.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, again you will see they are not only satisfied with this and they are making the Visitor so powerful. Sir, I do not deny that at times it is necessary for the Visitor to interfere. But when? He should interfere when there is complete breakdown of machinery and all that. No Government can remain an idle spectator, I admit that. But under normal circumstances there should be no governmental interference. Here, Sir, there is no question of abnormal circumstances. But according to this even in normal circumstances they can interfere. And Sir, look here, not contort with this, they have made the Vice-Chancellor all powerful. Sir, I would quote again from the Bill itself.

"The Upacharya (Vice-Chancellor) may, if he is of opinion that immediate action is necessary on any

matter, "—I put emphasis on any matter—"exercise any power conferred on any authority of the University by or under this Act and shall report to such authority the action taken by him on such matter :

Provided that if the authority concerned is of opinion that such action ought not to have been taken, it may refer the matter to the Paridarsika (Visitor) whose decision shall be final."

It means what ? The Vice-Chancellor may take any action without any reference to the Court, the Samsad, the Executive Council, the Gram Samiti. So, these are as bodies only show-pieces. You have the bodies with majority of the nominated people, the people selected on the basis of rotation, on the basis of superiority and then if necessary the Vice-Chancellor without any reference to these bodies can take any action.

There is only one provision whereby an employee of the University has been given a scope for representation. Otherwise in all other matters the Vice-Chancellor is supreme.

The question is can we really make the Vice-Chancellor such powerful ? There is one argument that if you want to run the University, the man who is responsible for running the University day-to-day administration should have the power. When Rabindranath Tagore was at the helm of affairs he saw to it that this institution was wedded to democracy, dedicated to the cause of education free from all corruption or products of selfishness. He was powerful, people accepted it. But can you give such powers to the pigmies ? All are not Rabindranath Tagores, all are not great people. Can you give those powers to the intellectual pigmies, the powers which you can give to the intellectual giants ? I think that is where they should be controlled because pigmies will always use the powers without any restraint and for purposes other than academic. It may so happen. That is why, in democracy it is absolutely necessary that there should be democratic control on the Executive. Otherwise, the Executive will

misuse his powers. I do not find any reason why the Upacharya has been made so powerful.

Sir, everywhere you will find that this basis of popular election has been done away with. Mr. Deputy-Speaker was drawing my attention to the Joint Committee. I was going through all the records, the persons whom they met. I would like to ask : Did they meet the *adhyapakas*, the teachers ? Did they meet the students ? Did they meet the karmacharis ? I have with me their memorandum. I have with me what the students have written to the Government, what the karmacharis have written to the Government, what the teachers have written to the Government. For the first time we find the other day, 'cease work' was observed in Visva-Bharati. It never happened before. Why ? The students, the employees and teachers jointly protested against the provisions of the Bill in which there is no provision for election. The teachers resented it. Why ? Just because this principle of rotation is undemocratic. They want to choose their representative. Otherwise, whom he will represent ? Democracy means representation. The other day Mr. Jagan Nath Kaushal, our Law Minister, was telling that 'we had been elected by the people, we represent the majority opinion of the people.' Well, accepted. That is why you are in power. But the man who is going and sitting in the Court or in the Executive Council on the basis of rotation, whom he is going to represent ? In a democracy he must represent the majority.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : It is 'guided' democracy.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Suppose a man goes to the Court and he is not liked by any of the teachers. Then whom he is going to represent ? On whose behalf he will speak ? I do not understand the logic behind it. You cannot do it, it is undemocratic. That is why you will find a strange thing. There, the students belonging to the Congress(1), the Ruling Party, and also belonging to the Left Front parties are jointly agitating against the provisions of this Bill. Please note, both the Congress (1) students and Leftist students are jointly

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty]

agitating. Sir, I quote here from *India Today* dated March 31, 1984. It says :

"An indicator of the depth of feeling on the campus is the fact that both the Congress-backed Chhatra Parishad (I) and the Marxist Students Federation of India have joined forces. Gautam Bhattacharya and Subha Bose, leaders of the rival organisations say that despite their political differences, they are determined to fight the issue together, 'as it threatens our very existence.' "

That is how the students have united because they feel that it threatens their very existence.

Very interesting argument has been put forward. Who will be representing the students? Meritorious ones, the prize winning ones! Now the meritorious ones and the prize winning ones may not be very active in public life. It is possible that they may be book worms. Mr. Ranga, not many meritorious students of our country joined the freedom movement. There were decidedly some meritorious students. Can this be the principle in democracy? I do not understand this. And that is why rightly the students are protesting. The teachers have also submitted their memorandum. They are protesting. The karamcharis have also submitted their memorandum to the Government. I do not know how the Joint Select Committee dealt with it. They have said, we want to elect our representatives. Not only that, the Delhi Executive Body and Academic Council, they are packed with nominated members, ex-officio members, who are in majority. Any way, the people who are responsible to run the university, who will give the idea of Rabindranath Tagore flesh and blood, these people, who are against this Bill. Then how will you run the university? What is your principle? If the students are dis-satisfied, karamcharis are dis-satisfied, then how are you going to run the university, I do not understand? I think, the Education Minister will make it convincingly clear to the House that the election principle should be restored. I again

say that 1978 Bill did make some provision for election. To this Government when we say you are authoritarian, they say that we are democratic. This is exactly why we call you authoritarian. This is one of the reasons. There are other reasons also.

Then you will see, in 1978 Bill there was no provision for a Tribunal for settling the issues. But in 1983 Bill they have made provision for a tribunal for settling the issues. Now they have adopted it. All teachers including Congress(I) teachers demonstrated against Hospitals and other Institutions Bill. There was compulsory adjudication. In 1978 it was not there. The whole philosophy, the authoritarian philosophy that we find in the Bill and that is done in the name of Rabindranath Tagore, in the name of these lofty ideas. That is why I started by saying it is an insult to Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore.

The Education Minister must be knowing the recommendations of the Masood Committee. Previous Government appointed Justice Masood. Why are you not following the recommendations of the Masood Committee? Why are you not following Gajendragadkar Commissions Report—What it recommended for the management of the university, for its democratic structure? Now, there is a very dangerous trend.

I have gone through the recent U.G.C. Report. You will be astonished that the people who have nothing to do with academic community, most probably they taught at one time, most probably pre-historic days, they are not in touch with the academic community. They are the people in the U.G.C. Of course, there are two or three people who are teachers. But they have recommended—what? That to maintain peace in universities, there should be no election, to maintain peace in the universities there should be a peace keeping force, uniform people, to maintain peace in the university, there should be no politics. Why should there be politics then? The students would not be discussing politics in the colleges and universities.

The teachers will not be discussing politics. Then who will be doing it? Most

probably they want that musclemen, black-marketeers, hoodlums and others should indulge in politics. That is their idea of democracy. That is why I say that where there is no democracy, there is always discontent. I think, you agree with me, Sir. In Pakistan there is dictatorial system and there is discontent...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please wind up.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : I am concluding, Sir. I wish to say only one thing. It was Aristotle, the father of political science, a very worthy student of Plato, who said this while defending democracy, why democracy is an ideal form of Government ; he analysed democracy with an objective mind and said, 'It is because no man is infallible, no man can singly see the truth ; democracy is good because it believes in collective wisdom'. Where is this collective wisdom ? For collective wisdom, the people must have the right to choose. That is the very basis of democracy. I expected something good since this is Visva-Bharati, since the Government is pledge-bound to maintain the autonomy of the University, to maintain the democracy of the University, to maintain the dignity of the teachers. But I am really sorry I find only bureaucratisation, negation of collective wisdom and an attempt at regimentation. The Bill has quoted as to what are the ideals that should be pursued. I have no quarrel with that. I do not believe in what Kipling said : "East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet". No, Sir. We shall meet. We cannot create any artificial barriers to our culture. The cultures should mingle. Visva-Bharati should take on an international character. Rabindranath Tagore wanted it to be so. I want that students should come not only from West Bengal, but from all other places, from all the States of India, the teachers should come from all the States of India. The University should attract brilliant teachers. Rabindranath Tagore invited teachers from Silvan Levy and Tucci and they came. In Visva-Bharati today you have the richest collection of Chinese literature in Cheena Bhavan. One year back I went there. It is a rich collection. But where are the brilliant scholars ? Who will make use of them ? We should

attract brilliant scholars ; we should invite brilliant teachers, "Please come here ; this is the University of the world". Let there be exchange of ideas without any fetters, without any barriers. Let us pursue the truth, let us pursue knowledge. But what is happening ? There has been a steady deterioration in the standard of teaching and there has been deviation from the ideals of Rabindranath Tagore. The University is expanding on the conventional lines. Tagore did not want it. You will appreciate that Tagore believed that India lived in villages, and that is why in Sriniketan he wanted the students to study agriculture, how to develop agriculture, how to develop production, how to modernise. I think, Government should think about all these things.

I would like to ask the Education Minister one question : where you have this limited freedom for teachers, where you have this bureaucratisation, do you expect that brilliant scholars will come to Visva-Bharati to teach ? When other Universities offer them better conditions of service and better freedom, the brilliant teachers would not be attracted to Visva-Bharati. They were attracted when Gurudev was there. He invited them, he gave them freedom, he gave them dignity. But in this Bill you are trying to destroy all these.

Before I conclude, I would like to say this. They were talking about West Bengal Universities. I am proud enough to say that in Calcutta and other Universities we have made provision for democratisation, more than 75% of the members.... (*Interruptions*) You kindly tell them. Knowledge is power. Without knowledge they cannot have power. We have got the greatest possible democratic representation in our Universities Act and it has been acclaimed by all. See how democratic it is that even out of the panel recommended by the Senate on proportional representation you have been able to even appoint a Vice-Chancellor not enjoying the confidence of the majority. That is beside the point. I have no time ; otherwise I would have compared the Bill with the Calcutta University Bill to show how we have given representation to the students, to the teachers, to the karmacharis and other democratic organisa-

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty]

tions and where there is a preponderance of democratic elements in all the bodies of the University. That is what we have followed. We have followed the recommendations of the Education Commissions. We have taken from Aligarh University, from Kerala University, from Bombay University and also we have enriched it and expanded it. I would request the Government to give a serious consideration. The Bill has been passed by the Rajya Sabha, in the Lok Sabha I think the Education Minister should see reason. I have said something. Either she should successfully refute it or accept it and change the Bill and bring it again so that the democratic character of the University, its freedom and its distinct nature can be maintained.

I conclude with this. Visva-Bharati University is a University with a difference and this should be maintained. Democracy and freedom—these should be maintained.

PROF. N.G. RANGA (Guntur) : While my friend Mr. Chakraborty was holding forth in his usual eloquent and apparently reasonable manner, I was just wondering what a fine thing it would be to transport him by free air passage to Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Romania and what else, and to Soviet Russia and also to China and let him plead with them in the same reasonable and pliant manner as he has been pleading with us for democracy.

His speech, shorn of a few fringes here and there, would make an excellent appeal to all those friends there and I wonder how they will receive him. Now he would be doing it there not to speak of Pakistan and Bangladesh or any of those countries, in the interests of the whole of their countries and their peoples whereas he has put forward this plea for the sake of these small entities that we have ennobled as Universities within this huge gamut of democratic India and democratic States as well as democratic Parliament here at the Centre. There is a world of difference between that and this. My hon. friend also knows the distinction between the degrees of evaluation.

Now for a small thing as it gains a bigger

and bigger size, a saturation point comes and qualitative changes take place. That is according to Marxist dialectics. Here also, between a government for a country and a university in a particular area for a particular number of people, ranging from professors, Deans of Faculties right down to karmacharis with the students as well as Professors and Lecturers in between there is a world of difference.

Therefore, what applies to the whole of the country, of the state and this Government cannot, may not apply with equal exactitude or correctness to the smaller entities. Apart from that, we all pledged ourselves for a democratic governance for our universities when the whole of them were under the control of the British. But, after the British left, we have established our democratic regime in the State level as well as for the whole of the country. We began to wonder whether we should continue according to our earlier paths of agitations, eloquence, perorations and speeches. This is what has happened.

Shantiniketan was transformed into a university at that stage when the late lamented son of Rabindranath Tagore was good enough to grace my place and other places also here including our leader, Jawaharlal Nehru and pleaded that Shantiniketan should be turned into a modern university according to all these ordinances, rules and regulations and statutes. I put it to him also—would it be better to imprison Shantiniketan into this kind of a statute with all the limitations. He said 'Now that freedom has been won'. There are various other universities who are having so many of the staff. We cannot carry on in the manner in which Gurudev was carrying on with that great institution. We would need crores and crores of rupees. It would be best, he thought that it should be turned into a modern type of university. The modern type of university has its own limitations. He was prepared to accept them. I cooperated with him. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru appreciated that idea and then it took the shape of a statute here. Even then we provided for the two elements—nomination as well as the election. For certain bodies there would be nominations and for certain

others, there would be elections. Even where we provided for election we provided for panels also and, from out of them, one or two would have to be selected. All these various elements of choice and various types of choice were mooted and were adopted and were incorporated.

My hon. friend, Dr. Chakraborty has already educated me as well as the House as to the various times when this university had been dealt with by our Parliament. I need not go into all these details. I would only like to remind the House of what is happening to-day. He says—How can you keep politics away? It is not that politics. They can certainly discuss politics as we were discussing in our universities here in India as well as abroad. I had some experience of Oxford University, London University and Cambridge University. I know how the American Universities are being run. To some extent, at least, I have some knowledge of these things. They can discuss all these things. When it comes to dealing with the teachers—the relations between the teachers and students, I say that students in India have been tutored, encouraged and even incited by various rival political parties which are now carrying on their activities in our country, in our Legislatures as well as other political activities. They are all interested in utilising the students, helping them as it were, according to their own ideas and exploiting and bringing them into the vortex of their own party politics and then trying to set them—one against the other and drawing them into the battle fields between themselves with a majority for this side or that side in another direction. So, we have got to give a re-thinking to our ideas on how to introduce democracy or not to introduce democracy, how to withdraw democracy or condition the democracy and how to shape democracy in such a manner that it would not do too much harm to our universities. We had had ideals at one time when Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore was there. Were there them all these bodies? If they were there, were there democratic decisions, rules and regulations? Was it not a fact, Sir, that he used to decide and he was the final authority—and other people had only to go and then make their own representations to him directly or indirectly,—indirectly through

various intermediary stages? He was all in all.

That is not the kind of university we are thinking of now. This is the kind of university that we are thinking of all over India, any number of universities, there are more than 100 universities. In most of the universities an atmosphere of industrial strife has been introduced most unfortunately. What has happened in Benaras Hindu University and Aligarh University, to take only Central Universities? What is happening to my own University there in Andhra? What is happening to our own agricultural universities? Everywhere there is trouble. Students do not ask for it, but they are tuned, trained, and incited and excited to move in this direction. People are interested in getting as many students as possible into their own wings. It was all right in those days when I was organising students when I was a professor; afterwards I became Congress Agitator; then when I was doing underground work I used to draw students because at that time we were fighting against British imperialism, British dictatorship. But now we should not deal with these things with our tongue-in-our-cheek, if I may put it in such a harsh manner. We are dealing with our own democratic society, democratic governments here. We are not interested in encouraging terrorists and so called extremists and other people who do not believe in democracy. We want our national affairs to be decided by debate—that is why we have this Parliament.

What are the decisions that those people have got to make?—Who is to be the Dean of the Faculty? Who is to be the Chief Professor? Who is to be the Professor? Who is to be the Reader? Who is to be the Lecturer?—for all these things you want the students to come in with all their politics—politics which is being dinned into their ears by others from outside. Students are not the leaders; students are not the arbiters, students are not the people who take all decisions in this country. We only project all these things as a reflex of our own selves as an extension of all of us. Therefore we have got to take care to see that first of all our students learn how to deal with democracy. (*Interruptions*) Walesa is

[Prof. N.G. Ranga]

not dead ; all praise for him. But my friends are not all praise for him. Walesa is not even so great a democrat as my friend Mr. Chakraborty. How they have dealt with Calcutta University ? He thinks he has done wonderful things ! What about the other universities everywhere else ? Therefore Sir, let us not beat this horse of democracy to such an extent that it simply dies under the weight of our own eloquence and our own words. There can be democracy and democracy. For the last 10 or 15 years in all universities there is not 'democracy' but 'demonocracy'—It is not students, it is the fundamentalists who have been having a greater hold and a bigger following with really terrible results. They have been playing mischief among our students. Many of our friends have been saying that there were students, who were not adult education students, who had been there, who had done their MA again and again,—afterwards they pretended to be doing research work, for Ph.D. and so on—getting students into their own circle ; they are still carrying on as students, as leaders of students, playing mischief. Sir, in the Benaras Hindu University how much mischief they have carried on ! In the Aligarh University I do not know how much of mischief they have carried on. It is to the same extent, in a similar manner. Therefore, we have got to be say extremely careful. Let us take ourselves a little more seriously and let us also be honest to ourselves. If we are democrats, then you should be democrat in every aspect of your own political activities but our friends are not so. We are democrats and at the same time we have the limitations of democracy. Therefore, let us make a clear breast of it. But my hon. friends, Communist people, Communist Party (Marxists) and Naxalites and what is called the extremists, all these friends, let them be as honest as we are and we profess to confess ourselves to be...

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Prof. Ranga, how do you say so and you are clubbing all these, Naxalites and Communists, together ?

PROF. N.G. RANGA : I do not attribute motives. But don't throw stones at others

while you are in the glass house.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : We believe in socialist democracy.

PROF. N.G. RANGA : Glass houses are all right when you grow these hot-house flowers. But glass house would not help practical politics. Now, there is no other country in the world—except Russia, except America, I suppose—where there are more than 100 universities. We have them here. We have here in our country the largest number of students. But at the same time unfortunately, we have students who protest because they are not allowed to copy in the Examinations, students who dictate when the examinations should be held and where they should be held which Professor should be promoted and which Lecturer should not be promoted and so on.

Under these circumstances, I personally feel that these provisions are fair sound basis that we can possibly have and I am sure that the Joint Select Committee had lightened our burden by placing this Bill, more or less in a final form.

I would like to offer one piece of advice, if I may, to the Education Ministry and the Educationists all over the country. In regard to the appointment of the Vice-Chancellors, I would like the Government of India, not only the Government of India, but the State Governments and their Education Ministers also, to examine the possibility of extension of the same principles which we are now trying to extend in regard to the appointment of Chief Justice of High Courts. Our Universities now most unfortunately are becoming prey to sectarianism, parochialism, linguistic rivalry and jingoism of local provincialism and thereafter they descend to the level of casteism also. Each State has come to have not less than 4 or 5 States, except the North-Eastern States. In regard to these 4 States even the learned people, professors, go on trying to play to the tune of casteism in order to obtain Vice-Chancellorship and the local Chief Ministers are trying to balance these appointments according to the political importance of these respective castes. This is a virus, a more dangerous virus, than the kind of virus we

have in our urban life. Politicians have put their fingers so deep into the University politics. The sooner the Government of India, educational experts, our Ministers and the State Ministers come to grips with this problem, the better it would be for the unity of our country. So, I would like them to study the possibility of shifting Vice-Chancellors by choosing the Vice-Chancellors from States other than the States concerned so that we can come to have some advantage of the earlier practice. There used to be Bengali Vice-Chancellor for Lahore University. For Benaras Hindu University, we had Vice-Chancellors from University of Maharashtra. To the greatest possible extent, if we can have inter-state Vice-Chancellors, it may possibly help to introduce the consciousness of India's unity into the minds of the professors and other staff. Supposing a Punjabi, it does not matter whether he is a Sikh or a Hindu, goes down to Madras, he would be aloof from the local caste wars and he is likely to be a little less parochial and a little more nationalistic. He may be of help in reminding them about the existence of India. They may begin to remember during their rivalries that they are members of this country and they should think about the unity of India. Till now no effort has been made in this direction.

Till now, you know, three Bengalis are to be selected by the Visva-Bharati Court and sent to the Visitor. These three happen to be always Bengalis. This method is not limited to Shantiniketan alone. The situation is the same in Andhra also. We have got five or six Universities in Andhra and this terrible caste trouble is going on there also.

In this regard, my suggestion is like this. Out of these three, at least one member should be from outside the State, as far as possible. Out of these two Bengalis, the one who is more of an Indian, more of a Universalist, who shares not only the views of Tagore and recites the poems of Tagore, but from the core of his heart is inspired by Tagore, may be chosen. This sort of effort has to be made by the Education Minister in this country and some thought should be given to it. I am mooted this idea for consideration by the Education Minister and the Education Ministry in consultation with

other Vice-Chancellors, other Education Ministers and the University Grants Commission also. Whatever effort the Government can make, they should make as soon as possible.

On the top of it, I want them to look upon these universities as seed-beds for our future intellectuals, savants, saints, and leaders of our country and these seed-beds should not be poisoned by bad insecticide and bad manures which are being introduced in the name of political parties into the academic spheres of learning. And then alone exploration into the future and into space will be possible and fruitful. Thank you, Sir.

श्री राम किंकर (बाराबंकी) : अधिष्ठाता महोदय, मैं आपका आभारी हूँ कि आपने प्रस्तुत विश्व भारती विधेयक, 1984 पर बोलने का अवसर दिया है। मैं इस विधेयक का स्वागत करता हूँ।

मान्यवर, गुरुदेव रवीन्द्र नाथ टैगोर ने 1921 में बंगाल में शान्ति निकेतन की स्थापना की थी। उनके विचार देश में ही नहीं विश्व में शान्ति स्थापित करने के थे। हमारी संस्कृति और संगीत का पाश्चात्य देशों में प्रचार और प्रसार हो। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य है कि सन् 1970 में अन्य यूनिवर्सिटियों की तरह से यहां पर भी उपद्रव हुए। सम्पत्ति को जलाया गया और क्षति पहुंचाई गई तथा मारपीट भी की गई। एक ऐसी कल्पना जो गुरुदेव ने की थी, लेकिन उसके विपरीत उस संस्था में इस तरह की घटनाएं और कलेश हो रहे हैं। इसलिए इस आदरणीय पार्लियामेंट में 1951 में एक विधेयक अधिनियमित किया गया था। उसकी कुछ रूपरेखा बनी, लेकिन वह ठीक से चल नहीं पाई, उसमें बहुत सी खामियां थीं। फिर 1971 में पार्लियामेंट में अधिनियम बना, उसके बाद कलकत्ता हाई कोर्ट के एक भूतपूर्व जज की अध्यक्षता में 8 सदस्यों की एक कमेटी बनी जिसने एक बहुत बड़ी रिपोर्ट दी। उसके बाद 1978 में एक बिल पेश हुआ, उसके बाद 1980 में भी पेश हुआ, उसके बाद एक ज्वाइंट सिलेक्ट कमेटी बनी जिसने बृहद रूप से इसमें संशोधन किए

[श्री राम किकर]

और अब एक अच्छा विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया गया है।

इसमें जो प्रावीजन्ज हैं उनमें नामिनेशन्ज और सिलैक्शन्ज दोनों के लिए प्रावधान है पदाधिकारियों तथा विद्यार्थियों के लिए रिप्रेजेंटेशन, ज्येष्ठता और योग्यता के आधार पर व्यवस्था है। लेकिन मेरा आपके माध्यम से शिक्षा मंत्री जी से एक अनुरोध है—इसको केवल बंगाल प्रदेश तक सीमित न रखकर हिन्दुस्तान के अन्य प्रान्तों तथा विश्व के अन्य देशों से भी इसका सम्बन्ध हो ताकि प्राच्य सभ्यता तथा पाश्चात्य शिक्षा और रविन्द्र नाथ टैगोर की विचारधाराओं का सामंजस्य और समन्वय हो सके।

विद्यार्थियों के प्रवास हेतु छात्रावासों की पर्याप्त व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए। शिक्षा का माध्यम यदि उनकी मातृभाषा में नहीं है तथा उनको पुस्तकें प्राप्त नहीं होती हैं तो इसमें भी बहुत कठिनाई होती है। रुपये का जहां तक सम्बन्ध है—सरकार को रुपये की पूरी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए ताकि गुरुदेव की जो परिकल्पना थी, वह सही रूप में साकार हो सके। गुरुदेव की ग्रामीण विकास के बारे में भी एक विचारधारा थी और उसके विकास के लिए उन्होंने काफी प्रयास किया था। विज्ञान, तकनीकी क्षेत्र, संगीत, कला और पेन्टिंग, इन सब विषयों पर उनके अपने विचार थे और वे उनको सीमित नहीं रखना चाहते थे। वे चाहते थे कि विश्व में उनका प्रचार और प्रसार हो। मैं अधिक न कहकर इस विधेयक का स्वागत करता हूँ।

आचार्य भगवान देव (अजमेर) : सभापति जी, आज गुरुदेव रवीन्द्र नाथ टैगोर की 123वीं जयन्ती देश और विदेश में मनाई जा रही है। इस अवसर पर शिक्षा मंत्री जी के द्वारा विश्व भारती के सम्बन्ध में जो बिल पेश किया गया है, वास्तव में वह बहुत स्तुत्य कार्य है और इसके लिए आप अभिनन्दन के पात्र हैं। आपने इतना सुन्दर बिल पेश किया है जिसकी राज्य सभा ने स्वीकृति दे दी

है। दोनों सदनों की प्रवर समिति भी उस पर विचार कर चुकी है—अब यदि कोई इस बिल का विरोध करता है तो मुझे उस व्यक्ति की बुद्धि पर तरस आता है। मैं इस सदन से यह आशा रखता हूँ—कि यह सदन भी राज्य सभा का अनुकरण करके सर्वसम्मति से इस बिल को पास करेगा।

अभी प्रो० चक्रवर्ती कह रहे थे कि गुरुदेव टैगोर ने अपने खानदान के किसी व्यक्ति को वहां नहीं रखा, उन्होंने लोकशाही की बड़ी दुहाई दी। पता नहीं वह बंगाल में रहते हैं या चीन में रहते हैं या रूस में उनका दिमाग चलता है। उनको इतना भी पता नहीं कि यह जमीन उनके पूज्य पिता देवेन्द्र नाथ टैगोर ने ली थी और गुरुदेव रविन्द्र नाथ टैगोर ने वहां पैसा लगाकर उसको वट-वृक्ष का रूप दिया। श्री अबनिन्द्र नाथ और रविन्द्र नाथ का क्या सम्बन्ध था—मैं समझता हूँ ये उससे अनभिज्ञ हैं, उनको पता नहीं है। पता नहीं इनका दिमाग चीन या रशिया कहां-कहां घूमता रहता है। वरना इस तरह की बात दावे के साथ इस सदन में ये नहीं कर सकते।

सभापति महोदय, इस संस्था को स्थापित हुए कई वर्ष हो गए हैं। 1863 में इसकी स्थापना हुई और 1888 में इस संस्था में न्यास का रूप लिया। गुरु रवीन्द्र नाथ टैगोर ने 5 विद्यार्थियों से सादगी के वातावरण में इस संस्था को बहुत बड़ा अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रूप दिया। इसके अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रूप को सामने रख करके विश्व में भारत की संस्कृति का परिज्ञान कराने के लिए विश्व शांति और बंधुत्व का संदेश देने के लिए, संसार भर के मजहब, धर्म और विचारधाराएं हैं, चाहे ईसाई हो, इस्लाम हो, बौद्ध हो, जैन हो या हिन्दू हो या पारसी हो, हर प्रकार की संस्कृतियों का सुमेल हो, संगम हो, इस बात को उन्होंने कहा। उन्होंने सब संस्कृतियों के संगम की कल्पना की थी। मैं चक्रवर्ती जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वे सब संस्कृतियों को मानते हैं। वे तो साम्यवाद की ही संस्कृति को मानते हैं। संगम की बात कहने का आपको क्या हक है। (व्यवधान)

चौबे जी बैठे रहिए**। (व्यवधान)

श्री रशीद मसूद (सहारनपुर) : सभापति महोदय, इस मुल्क में जात-पात समाप्त करने की बात कही जाती है। लेकिन इस तरह से कैसे होगा। (व्यवधान)

سزى رشيد مسود (سہارنپور) : سہا پتی مجھ سے۔ اس ملک میں ذات پات سماعت کرنے کی بات کہی جاتی ہے۔ لیکن اس طرح سے کیسے ہوگا۔۔۔ (انٹراپٹیشن)

आचार्य भगवान देव : मेरे कहने का मतलब है किये शांति से बैठे रहें। इस तरह से बोलना लोक सभा की परम्परा नहीं है।

श्री रशीद मसूद : आप जो बोल रहे हैं, क्या वह लोकसभा की परम्परा है।

سزى رشيد مسود : آيہ بول رہے ہیں، کیا وہ لوگ سکھ کی پرمیتر ہے۔

श्री राजेश कुमार सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) : सभापति महोदय, यह सदन की मर्यादा का सवाल है। आप इस बात को कैसे अलाऊ कर सकते हैं।

सभापति महोदय : मैं देख लूंगा। आप बैठिए।

आचार्य भगवान देव : इनको सहस्रूम नहीं हुआ क्योंकि ये समझते हैं मैंने जिस लहजे में कहा है। बीच में इनको नहीं बोलना चाहिए था।

सभापति महोदय उसके बाद सन 1912 में गुरुदेव लंदन और अमरीका गए। उनकी गीतांजलि छपी। उससे इस संस्था को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रूप मिला और उस गीतांजलि के आधार पर दूसरे साल सन 1913 में उनको नोबल पुरस्कार मिला और इस संस्था ने एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रूप धारण कर लिया। उसके बाद सन् 1915 में पूज्य महात्मा गांधी जब अफ्रीका से हिन्दुस्तान में आए तो वे गुरुदेव से मिलने के लिए शांति निकेतन गए और कुछ दिन वहां रहे। उससे इस संस्था ने राजनीतिक दृष्टि से महत्व प्राप्त किया। देश को

आजादी दिलानी थी। बड़े-बड़े विचारक बैठे और सन् 1922 में सोसायटी एकट के अधीन इसका रजिस्ट्रेशन कराया गया। इसमें बड़े-बड़े व्यक्तियों ने अपना योगदान दिया। सी एफ एंड्रयूज, डब्ल्यू डब्ल्यू पिअरमन, काका साहेब कालेलकर आदि व्यक्तियों का योगदान रहा। संगीत के महान व्यक्ति श्री भीम राव शम्भूजी ने भी अपनी साधना वहां की। श्री कृष्ण, कृपलानी जैसे तपस्वी व्यक्ति ने भी वहां अपना जीवन-यापन किया और अनेक व्यक्तियों को शिक्षा दी। अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी के बारे में हीन भावना से जो बाल कही गई, उनके चांसलर सम्बन्धी, उसे सुनकर मुझे बड़ा दुख हुआ। जो व्यक्ति अपने आपको प्रोफेसर मानता है और इस तरह से आशेष करता है और शिक्षा-शास्त्री बनने का ठेका लेता है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि महर्षि दयानन्द, जो आर्य-समाज के इतने बड़े संस्थापक थे, क्या उन्होंने किसी यूनिवर्सिटी से एम० ए० और पी० एच० डी० की थी? उन्होंने जो वेदों का अध्ययन किया, उसको सारी दुनिया के लोग भी समझ नहीं पायेंगे। महर्षि वाल्मीकि कोई प्रोफेसर नहीं थे। उन्होंने रामायण की रचना की। क्या ये लोग उसको समझ पाएंगे जो अपने आपको प्रोफेसर कहते हैं? क्या कभी उसके राज को समझा है? आज, एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय शक्ति के रूप में संसार के सामने प्रधानमंत्री खड़ी हैं। बड़े-बड़े राष्ट्र और जहां पर डिक्टेटरशिप है, उन्होंने भी प्रधानमंत्री को अपना अध्यक्ष माना है। उस व्यक्ति के सम्बन्ध में एक साधारण-सा व्यक्ति** वह सदन में खड़े होकर आक्षेप करता है।... (व्यवधान)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore) : He is speaking. **What** is he speaking ? (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I agree with you. Why do you want to rush ? Let me deal with this. I am quite intelligent to understand. Do not be more alarmed, my friend, than necessary. Listen to me. You sit down, Professor Sahib, you sit down.

श्री राजेश कुमार सिंह : इनको माफी मांगनी चाहिए ।*** (व्यवधान)

श्री रशीद मसूद : यह न्यूयाक नहीं है । हिन्दुस्तान का पार्लियामेंट है ।*** (व्यवधान)

→.....()

شہزادہ اشرف علی خان تھانوی

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : He must first apologise.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have to listen to me first. I stand up, and you listen to me. I am controlling the House, not you, my friend. I will tell you. All of you sit down. Now, this will not be recorded. I am certain that this language was not to be used here. And I am certain that you should feel sorry about it, to have said such things. I hope you see my point.

PROF. N.G. RANGA : You withdraw.

15.01 hrs.

(SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI in the Chair)

आचार्य भगवान देव : सभापति जी, जैसा शिक्षा मंत्री जी ने कहा, प्रधान मंत्री जी जब वहाँ चांसलर बनीं तो वे प्रधान मंत्री की हैसियत से चांसलर नहीं बनीं बल्कि उन्होंने वहाँ शिक्षा ली, शान्ति निकेतन में रहकर उन्होंने शान्ति का संदेश अपने जीवन में लाने की कोशिश की और आज वे सारे संसार में उसी का प्रचार और प्रसार कर रही हैं उसकी हैसियत से उनकी नियुक्ति की गई। बाकायदा उनका चुनाव हुआ है, लेकिन जब यहाँ पर उनके ऊपर आक्षेप किए जाते हैं तो मैं उसको अनुचित मानता हूँ। यहाँ पर ऐसी बातें नहीं कहनी चाहिए और इसीलिए मुझे उसका उल्लेख यहाँ पर करना पड़ा। उसके अलावा श्रीमती सरोजिनी नायडू जैसी महान विचारक इस संस्था से जुड़ी हुई हैं।

(श्री चिन्तामणि पाणिग्रही पीठासीन हुए)

उन्होंने इस संस्था की बहुत सेवा की। सन्

1951 में पण्डित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने इसे राष्ट्रीय स्वरूप प्रदान किया और उसके बाद इस संस्था का अच्छी तरह से विकास होता रहा। परन्तु जैसा मेरे एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा, सन् 1971 में वहाँ कुछ असामाजिक तत्वों ने तोड़-फोड़ की और उसके कारण हमारे देश के महान व्यक्तियों को सोचना पड़ा कि जिस महान उद्देश्य को लेकर इस अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय संस्था की स्थापना की गई ताकि संसार भर के हर वर्ग और हर मुल्क के लोग यहाँ आकर शांति-निकेतन और श्री-निकेतन की परिधि में स्थित शिक्षा भवन, विद्या भवन, कला भवन, संगीत भवन, विनय भवन, रविन्द्र भवन में आकर मानवता का संदेश लें, उसको दृष्टि में रखते हुए, बहुत सोच-समझकर आज यह बिल इस सदन में पेश किया गया है। अब वहाँ तीन निदेशकों की नियुक्तियाँ होंगी और तीन नये विभाग शुरू किए जाएंगे—प्रौढ़ शिक्षा, ग्राम्य पुनर्गठन, सहकारी संगठन, समाज कल्याण, कुटीर उद्योग आदि की प्रवृत्ति वहाँ चलेगी।

यहाँ पर लोकशाही के सम्बन्ध में आशंका खड़ी की गई तथा विशेषकर राष्ट्रमति जी को परिदर्शक अर्थात् विजिटर का पद दिया गया, उस पर आक्षेप किया गया, आपत्ति उठाई गई। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या राष्ट्रपति का पद हमारे देश में सर्वोच्च पद नहीं माना गया है। क्या उनका चुनाव लोकशाही के द्वारा नहीं किया जाता। यदि लोकशाही के माध्यम से चुनकर ही राष्ट्रपति के पद पर कोई व्यक्ति पहुँचता तो क्या उसको सारे हिन्दुस्तान के अधिकार नहीं मिल जाते। फिर किस आधार पर आप उनके इस संस्था का अधिकारी बना देने पर या कोई पद देने पर आपत्ति करते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसमें लोकशाही के विपरीत कोई बात नहीं है। राष्ट्रपति लोक सभा और राज्यसभा तथा राज्यों की विधान सभाओं के माध्यम से चुना जाता है। यहाँ पक्ष और विपक्ष के लोगों ने इस सम्बन्ध में अपने-अपने विचार रखे। हमारी ज्वान्ट प्रवर समिति में दोनों सदनों के हर पार्टी के सदस्य हैं, उसमें उन्होंने भी अपने विचार रखे हैं। क्या उसको भी आप लोकशाही नहीं समझते? यदि आप उसको डिक्लेटरशिप समझते हैं तो मुझे

बड़ा अफसोस है कि आप इस तरह की विचार-धारा रखते हैं।

यहां पर प्रोफेसर साहब ने कहा कि वहां पर जो पढ़े-लिखे व्यक्ति हैं, जिनको यहां पर किताबी-कोड़े की संज्ञा दी गई, मुझे बड़ा अफसोस होता है कि जिन शरारती तत्वों की राजनैतिक पाटियों की ओर से भी आलोचना हुई, जिनका उल्लेख हमारे रंगा साहब ने भी किया, जो उच्छृंखल व्यक्ति, विद्यार्थियों को प्रोत्साहन देकर, पैसा देकर तोड़-फोड़ करवाते हैं, हर यूनिवर्सिटी में अराजकता फैलाते हैं, क्या यही हमारी शिक्षा है। पहले जो विद्यार्थी क्लास में अच्छी तरह से शिक्षा ग्रहण करके मैट्रि पर आता था तो उसको मोनिटर बनाया जाता था, उसको क्लास और स्कूल के कुछ अधिकार दिए जाते थे, लेकिन आज उसके स्थान पर जो गुण्डागर्दी, शरारत, तोड़फोड़ वा आग लगाने के काम ज्यादा करता है, यूनिवर्सिटी के आधार पर वहां कब्जा जमाना चाहता है, उसको प्रोत्साहन देना; क्या यही हमारी शिक्षा है, क्या ऐसी शिक्षा पद्धति हम हिन्दुस्तान में चलाना चाहते हैं। इस तरह के यूनिवर्सिटी से हिन्दुस्तान आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता। मैं शिक्षा मंत्री जी से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि तमाम यूनिवर्सिटीज में जो विद्यार्थी अच्छी शिक्षा प्राप्त करना चाहता है, अच्छे मार्ग पर चलकर शिक्षा प्राप्त करना चाहता है, उनको वहां अधिकार मिलने चाहिए। इस बिल के जरिए आप जिस तरह का प्रयास करना चाहते हैं, उनको निश्चय ही प्रोत्साहन मिलना चाहिए अन्यथा जो राजनैतिक व्यक्तियों के हाथों में शरारती तत्व आज खेल रहे हैं जो हमारी शिक्षा-संस्थाओं में आग लगाकर देश को बर्बाद करना चाहते हैं। और इसके साथ-साथ एक और मांग करता हूँ, आप स्पष्टीकरण दें, सारे देश की जितनी यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं उनमें जो वाइस-चांसलर्स की नियुक्ति है, जिसका उल्लेख प्रोफेसर रंगा ने किया कि अलग-अलग प्रान्तों में अलग-अलग ढंग से हो रही है, कहीं कोर्ट से, कहीं प्रान्तीय सरकार द्वारा और कहीं किसी और के द्वारा, इसको आपको दूर करना पड़ेगा चाहे इसके लिए भले ही आपको बिल लाना पड़े। सारे देश की

यूनिवर्सिटीज में एकरूपता लानी पड़ेगी। आप बताएं ऐसा करना चाहते हैं कि नहीं? अगर आपको एकरूपता लानी है तो जरूरी है कि वाइस-चांसलर्स की नियुक्ति के बारे में बिल लाएं।

इन शब्दों के साथ महान गुरुदेव के नाम पर स्थापित महान संस्था जो अंतर्राष्ट्रीय है उसका गौरव बढ़ाने के लिए जो बहुत लोगों के बीच में से गुजरे इस बिल को पेश कर रही है उसका समर्थन करता हूँ और बिल पेश करने के लिए बधाई देता हूँ।

प्रो० अजित कुमार मेहता(समस्तीपुर): विश्व-भारती में शांति-निकेतन है और हमारे पूर्ववक्ता ने इस विधेयक पर बहस करते समय चर्चा की जिस प्रकार अशांतिपूर्ण बनाया वह वास्तव में अजीब है। जौइंट सेलेक्ट कमेटी ने अनुशंसा की कि विश्व-भारती का यह विशिष्ट कर्तव्य होना चाहिए कि वह शिक्षा के माध्यम से गुरुदेव के विचारों को कार्यरूप दे, उसी रूप में शैक्षिक कार्यक्रमों को भी लागू करे।

विश्वविद्यालय की स्थापना गुरुदेव ने जिस उद्देश्य से की थी उसमें उनकी संकल्पना एकता में अनेकता पर आधारित सांस्कृतिक मूल्यों का प्रचार और प्रसार ही नहीं था, बल्कि विश्वबंधुत्व की भावना का प्रचार भी इसमें सम्मिलित था और इसीलिए इसका नाम विश्व-भारती रखा गया था। परन्तु विश्व-भारती के छात्रों की सूची जब हम देखते हैं तो मुझे अफसोस होता है कि उसमें बंगाल के छात्रों की बहुसंख्या है, जो कि नहीं होनी चाहिए थी। कुछ न कुछ ऐसा प्रावधान किया जाना था जिसमें अन्य राज्यों, कम से कम अन्य राज्य और अन्य देश का भी उचित प्रतिनिधित्व छात्रों की संख्या में होता और तभी विश्व-भारती का नाम सार्थक होता। गुरुदेव केवल बंगाल की ही धरोहर नहीं थे, वह सारे देश के थे और बंगाल को ही उस पर अपना अधिकार नहीं जतलाना चाहिए।

यों तो सभी केन्द्रीय विश्वविद्यालयों के परिसरों में अनुशासन और शैक्षिक मापदंडों में निरावट

[प्रो० अजित कुमार मेहता]

आई है और कमोबेश रूप में यहां भी देखी जा सकती है। फिर भी मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि इस विश्वविद्यालय में उन मापदंडों के अनुपालन का काफी अधिक प्रयास रहता है। यद्यपि हम देश में कोई एक रीति नहीं बनाते हैं, फिर भी हमें प्रसन्नता है कि अनुशासन और शैक्षिक मापदण्डों का यहां पालन होता है और जगहों की अपेक्षा अधिक।

सभापति जी, टंगोर ने इस बात पर बल दिया था कि हम अपने आध्यात्मिक आदर्शों को तभी प्राप्त कर सकेंगे जब हम छात्रों को प्रकृति के निकट सम्पर्क में लाएंगे और उन्हें पड़ोसी गांवों के किसानों और मेहनतकश लोगों के सम्पर्क में लाएंगे। उन्होंने प्यार और बलिदान की आवश्यकता पर बल दिया।

इस त्रिधेयक में क्या प्रवर समिति ने इस पर कहीं जोर डाला है? लोकतांत्रिक परम्परा की चर्चा हुई। मुझे आश्चर्य होता है प्रो० रंगा पर। वचन में मैं स्व० पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू की एक किताब "हिन्दुस्तान की समस्या" पढ़ रहा था। पंडित जी ने भी इस पर विचार किया था। एक लेख में उन्होंने आश्चर्य व्यक्त किया था। उस समय का एस्टैब्लिशमेंट भी कहता था कि छात्रों में राजनीति नहीं आनी चाहिए। "हिन्दुस्तान की समस्या" एक बहुत पुरानी किताब है और सस्ता साहित्य मंडल से प्रकाशित हुई थी।

SHRI DEEN BANDHU VERMA (Udaipur) : He never said like that.

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA : You just go through *Hindustan Ki Samasya*.

SHRI DEEN BANDHU VERMA : He said they should be aware of the current politics, but he never said that the students should not be involved.

प्रो० अजित कुमार मेहता : मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि उन्होंने इतना मान लिया।

पंडित जी ने लिखा था कि उस समय के एस्टैब्लिशमेंट ने विद्यार्थियों में राजनीति लाने का विरोध किया था। पंडित जी ने भी इस बात की चर्चा की थी और उन्होंने कहा था कि विद्यार्थी इस देश के नागरिक बनेंगे और उनमें राजनीतिक चेतना का अभाव होना खतरनाक होगा। इसलिए उन्होंने इस बात की तसदीक की थी कि विद्यार्थियों में राजनीतिक चेतना आनी चाहिए। परन्तु आप कैसे राजनीतिक चेतना लाएंगे? क्या लोकतांत्रिक परम्पराओं का अनुकरण करके? लोकतांत्रिक परम्पराएं न चलने देकर क्या राजनीतिक चेतना बढ़ेगी? मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि कहीं का भी एस्टैब्लिशमेंट यह कहता है कि विद्यार्थियों में यह नहीं होनी चाहिए। उसका विरोध जो करते हैं, वह चाहते हैं कि विद्यार्थियों में भी राजनीतिक चेतना आए और जब वह लोग सत्ता में आते हैं तो उसका विरोध करते हैं। एस्टैब्लिशमेंट की बात करने लगते हैं।

प्रो० रंगा ने कहा कि उस समय की बात दूसरी थी, यह हर एस्टैब्लिशमेंट कहता है। क्या आज के युग में विद्यार्थियों में राजनीतिक चेतना नहीं आनी चाहिए? यहां पर विभिन्न विश्वविद्यालयों की विभिन्न बाडीज में विद्यार्थियों और शिक्षकों को नामित करने का प्रस्ताव है। इन नामित विद्यार्थियों का नामीनेशन किस आधार पर हुआ, वह किसका प्रतिनिधित्व उस बाडी में करेंगे? सिवाय अपने वह और किसका प्रतिनिधित्व करेंगे और किसके प्रतिनिधि हैं? और किसके प्रति उत्तरदायी हैं? हर आदमी का मत अलग हो सकता है। इस तरह का प्रतिनिधित्व प्रदान करने से आप क्या अपेक्षा और उम्मीद करते हैं? अगर आपको पूरी प्रजातांत्रिक पद्धति से असंतोष है तो बात दूसरी है परन्तु जो विस्तृत रूप में सही हो सकता है, वह छोटे रूप में गलत कैसे होगा, यह बात मुझे समझ में नहीं आती है।

एडमिशन पालिसी के बारे में धारा 20-सी में कहीं न कहीं यह प्रावधान होना चाहिए था कि भारत में कम-से-कम सभी राज्यों के छात्र एक निश्चित संख्या में इस विश्वविद्यालय में रहें।

किन्तु ऐसा कहीं प्रावधान नहीं है। तभी विश्व-विद्यालय के मूल उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति हो सकेगी अन्यथा नहीं। विश्वविद्यालय के सिलैबस का विस्तार किया गया है। यह मैं मानता हूँ कि कोई भी ऐसी शिक्षा सफल नहीं हो सकती जो जीविका अर्जित न करा सके, परन्तु इसका तात्पर्य यह नहीं है कि इस विश्वविद्यालय को भी देश के अन्य विश्वविद्यालय की तरह का ही बना दिया जाए। फिर तो जो इसके पीछे उद्देश्य हैं उन्हीं का हनन हो जाएगा। देश में चारों तरफ आर्ट्स कालेज हैं, ऐसे विश्वविद्यालय हैं जो आर्ट्स की शिक्षा देते हैं परन्तु इस विश्वविद्यालय को उनसे कुछ अलग ही बनना था।

आज सारे देश में नैतिक अवमूल्यन हो गया है। हमारे समाज की जो आज दशा है वह नैतिक अवमूल्यन के कारण ही है। इस नैतिक अवमूल्यन के अथाह सागर में इस विश्वविद्यालय के माध्यम से सही नैतिक-शिक्षा छात्रों को प्रदान की जा सकती थी परन्तु उसका स्वरूप ऐसा होता कि उसके साथ-साथ छात्र यहाँ से निकलने के बाद, स्नातक होने के बाद, अपनी जीविका अर्जित करने में भी सक्षम रहते। ऐसा रूप इस विश्वविद्यालय को देना चाहिए था।

जहाँ तक सिलैबस की बात है, एक बात समझ ले नहीं आती है। इसमें ग्रामीण पुनर्निर्माण सम्बन्धी शिक्षा का भी प्रावधान रखा गया है परन्तु वैज्ञानिक और टैक्निकल अध्ययन का कहीं उल्लेख नहीं है। मुझे सन्देह है कि बिना वैज्ञानिक एवं प्रौद्योगिक अध्ययन के ग्रामीण पुनर्निर्माण सम्भव नहीं हो सकेगा। इसलिए ग्रामीण पुनर्निर्माण का जो सिलैबस हो उसमें इस बात का ध्यान अवश्य रखा जाना चाहिए।

इस विधेयक की धारा 38 (1) में एक नया प्रयोग किया गया है—तीन सदस्यों की एक समिति बनाने का प्रावधान रखा गया है, जोकि वहाँ पर मतान्तर के कारण प्रैदा हुए झगड़ों का निपटारा कर सकेगी। इस समिति का निर्माण अपने में एक नवीन प्रयोग है और यदि यह प्रयोग

सफल हो तो मैं आशा करता हूँ दूसरे विश्व-विद्यालयों में भी इस प्रकार का प्रावधान रखा जाएगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं माननीय शिक्षा मन्त्री जी. से, अपने दिए गए सुझावों पर, ध्यान देने का अनुरोध करता हूँ।

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I feel privileged to support the Bill on Visva-Bharati University on an auspicious day today, which is 25th of Vaisakha, Tagore's birthday.

Sir, this is a Bill which has been drafted very well by the Joint Select Committee, and I wholeheartedly support it. I am very surprised and shocked to hear the speech of my learned friend, Prof. Satyasadhan Chakraborty, and I am also surprised to see his respect and love and all praise for Rabindranath Tagore. In the State to which he belonged, namely, West Bengal, it has been observed that now in their syllabus from University to the primary level, Rabindranath Tagore has got no place.

Sahaj Path was the most favourite book for the students at the primary level. Rabindranath Tagore's poems were given. I know from the beginning they have been objecting that *Sahaj Path* is not Rabindra Nath Tagore's book. In *Sahaj Path* there are many poems of Rabindra Nath Tagore. These have been deleted. The history in West Bengal syllabus now gives more importance to Lenin and Stalin and not to Rabindranath Tagore or Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose. (*Interruptions*) I am an uneducated man. All education is yours.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Have you gone through that book ?

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : I have seen all books. (*Interruptions*) Even then when this Bill was discussed in this House there are certain points which have been raised about the various clauses of the Bill. Well, I say this is a Bill which has been drafted by the Joint Select Committee. From the Report of the Joint Select Committee,

[Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev]

we have seen the Committee was represented by all political parties both from the Members of the Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha. Some Members belonging to CPM, CPI have given discussions in this Bill. The political parties left front have been telling "why should the representation on the Council be on the basis of merit or seniority?" They are questioning the formation of the Students' Council. This has been objected to and criticised. But I personally feel that this is a model Bill. It should not only be in Visva-Bharati but this should be all over the country. This is necessary. There should be uniformity of rules all over the country. The university to-day in our country has been converted into a hot-bed of political destructive activities. What have we seen in Assam? Gauhati University was the main centre for all this agitation in Assam which was neither good for the country nor for the people of Assam. The universities are being misused. There is no reason to say that students should not participate in politics. They should have political thinking and they should participate in politics. But they are involving themselves into politics which is very disruptive in its activities, which is destructive for the cause of the country. So, I fully support this Bill which has been drafted very well and I shall appeal to the Education Minister that in the appointment of the Vice Chancellor also there should be certain rules which should be framed by the Government of India, which should be followed all over the country, whether it is in West Bengal, Assam or in the Union Territory or anywhere.

What do we see in Calcutta? Shri Chakraborty has spoken too much. One Member of the House who contested election has lost in the election. It is in the democratic process that he lost. What happened? They did not accept defeat gracefully. They have made the issue of Governor. This issue is continuously going on. Wherever the Governor goes, the workers create troubles for him. It is not good for a particular State nor it is good for the country.

Now they have passed a Bill in West Bengal. I would appeal to them that they should not give concurrence to such a Bill which is against the concept....

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): Have you read that Bill? I want clarification. Do you know what is there?

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Sir, he wants me to read that Bill...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I would request Mr. Dev to read that Bill.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Is that a good piece of Bill? My point is that the system which was there was alright. If through that system talents like Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty and Shri Somnath Chatterjee could be produced by the Calcutta University, then what was wrong with that system which was there in Calcutta? They have good talents there. They claim that they are much more educated than many of us, and if I agree, it only means that the old Calcutta University Act was alright...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The 1979 Act was passed by the Left Front Government.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: I would appeal to the Education Minister that there should be uniformity of rules all over the country in election or selection of Vice-Chancellors. (Interruptions)

Before I conclude, again I would request the Education Minister that this Bill should be taken as a model Bill for all the Universities with certain modifications here and there, and it should be followed all over the country because the University campus all over the country has been converted into a campus for agitations and thereby the educational system is going worse day by day and we shall be answerable to our future generation. Therefore, this august body should take care of it. Let a comprehensive Bill for all the Universities be brought. There should be a prototype system for appointment of Chancellors and Vice Chancellors all over the country.

श्री रीतलाल प्रसाद वर्मा (कोडरमा): सभापति महोदय, विश्वभारती संशोधन विधेयक का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। यह विधेयक जो आज 13 वर्षों के अध्ययन, मनन और कमेटी में डालने के बाद

लाया गया है, इसे पहले लाते तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता। फिर भी इसे एक सर्वांगीण विधेयक कहा जा सकता है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके प्रावधान बहुत अच्छे हैं। जिस तरह से विश्व-भारती शान्ति-निकेतन में अवस्थित है और विश्व के सारे देशों के बीच प्राच्य संस्कृति और पाश्चात्य संस्कृति के तालमेल, तादात्म्य स्थापित करने की भावना हमारे गुरुदेव रविन्द्र नाथ ठाकुर में थी, उसी परिपेक्ष में यह बिल प्रस्तुत किया गया है, इसलिए यह सराहनीय है। गुरुदेव रविन्द्र नाथ ठाकुर की इस कल्पना को मूर्त रूप देने में जितना समय लगा उस दृष्टि से यह बिल बहुत ही अच्छा कहा जा सकता है। विश्व भारती को आज भी देश के लिए एक ऐतिहासिक प्रतीक के रूप में माना जा सकता है तथा उनकी जो भावना थी—इस विश्वविद्यालय में हिन्दू, बौद्ध, जैन, सिख, इस्लाम, ईसाई, सबकी कलाओं का अध्ययन, मनन और चिन्तन यहां पर किया जाएगा। उसमें किसी प्रकार का भेदभाव नहीं होगा, प्राच्य कला और संस्कृति तथा पाश्चात्य कला और संस्कृति के सम्बन्धों को इतना प्रगाढ़ बनाया जाएगा जिनसे भारत और एशिया के देशों के सम्बन्ध धीरे-धीरे बढ़ते चले जाएंगे। इसके साथ-साथ विश्व के गोलाधर्मों के बीच शान्ति की भावना का उदय हो और विश्व शान्ति स्थापित हो। हर व्यक्ति के हृदय से मनोमालिन्य और शोषण करने की भावना समाप्त हो, द्वेष और हिंसा का निदान हो। तो इस तरह से बहुत अच्छी भावनाओं के साथ नोबल प्राइज विजेता रवीन्द्र नाथ टैगोर ने यह कल्पना की थी। इसके लिए शान्ति निकेतन का एक अच्छा स्थल चयन किया था। उन्हें आशा थी कि इससे विश्व शान्ति स्थापित हो सकेगी। इसलिए सत्यं, शिवं और आदित्यं शब्दों का मेल किया था। ईश्वर को आध्यात्म के रूप में लोग समझ सकें और सभी देशों और धर्मों को एक ही स्वरूप मान सकें। अध्यापक और छात्र यहां सौहार्द्रपूर्ण वातावरण में रहेंगे और अशांति तथा क्लेश का यहां स्थान नहीं होगा। समग्र विश्व के कार्यकलापों का एकीकार होगा और एक जगह साथ-साथ सामाजिक विषयों का अनुसंधान होगा। इसके द्वारा कारगर उपायों पर निरंतर चिन्तन होगा। इस प्रकार से इसका बहुत ही अच्छा

उद्देश्य था। लेकिन अभी जो कुछ हुआ, बहुत-सी आलोचना हुई और अशांति का जो वातावरण बना, उससे रवीन्द्र नाथ टैगोर की भावना को मैं समझता हूँ कि चोट पहुंच सकती है। इस तरह की छींटाकशी करने से उस भावना पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ेगा। ऐसे विचार नहीं होने चाहिए। अगर गलतियां हैं तो उनको राजनीतिक छलछद्म से हटकर दूर किया जा सकता है। इसकी जो मूल भावना है, उसके विपरीत कोई बात नहीं होनी चाहिए। यह बात सही है कि इसमें राष्ट्रपति या प्रधानमंत्री चांसलर के रूप में रहें, इसमें राजनीतिक दलगत भावना हो सकती है लेकिन जहां तक इसके राष्ट्रीय महत्व का सवाल है, इस संस्था का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। इस तरह की संस्था का राष्ट्रीय स्वरूप होना चाहिए क्योंकि इसमें विश्व शान्ति का खयाल किया गया है और विश्व संस्कृति, शिक्षा और ललित कला के द्वारा विचार किया गया है। अगर इसमें प्रांतीयता और क्षेत्रीयता की बात आती है तो इसका उद्देश्य समाप्त हो जाता है। इसीलिए इसी दृष्टिकोण से इस पर विस्तृत रूप में विचार करना चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय, एक दो समस्याओं की ओर और आपका ध्यान आकषित करना चाहता हूँ। विश्व भारती में संस्कृत और पाली विभाग है। वहां पर जो प्राध्यापक हैं, उनके साथ बड़ा ही भेदभाव बरता जा रहा है। विश्व भारती में "रिसर्च असिस्टेंट" के पद हैं लेकिन विभिन्न पदों के वेतनमान अलग हैं। इसे पक्षपातपूर्ण कहा जा सकता है। मैं, एक उदाहरण देना चाहूंगा। संस्कृत विभाग के डा० मंजूल मयन्क एक प्राध्यापक हैं। वह, निरन्तर संस्कृत के अध्यापक रहे हैं। उनकी प्रोन्नति रीडर के पद पर अभी तक नहीं की गई। उनसे कम योग्यता के हर विभाग में जिन्होंने न पी० एच० डी० की है, न विशेष अध्ययन किया है और न रिसर्च के पेपर्स प्रस्तुत किए हैं, उन्हें रीडर तथा उससे आगे के पदों पर प्रोन्नत किया गया है। संस्कृत, पाली एवं प्राकृत विभाग, विश्व-भारती के विभागाध्यक्ष डा० वी० एन० बैनर्जी का एक कांफिडेंशियल लैटर पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

[श्री रीतलाल प्रसाद वर्मा]

"Dr. M. Mayank,

Please note that I will not let you become Reader and Professor in the Department, so long as I am Head. Better, look for elsewhere, preferably in your own province, U.P."

This was a letter dated 31-8-1981.

इस संस्था को विश्व-भारती न कहकर बँजर्जी भारती कहा जा सकता है। इस तरह की बातों को रोका जाना चाहिए। वहाँ पर पे-स्केल्स में भी बड़ा भेदभाव बरता जा रहा है। रवीन्द्र भवन और कला भवन के रिसर्च असिस्टेंट्स का पे-स्केल 425 से 700 तक है जबकि दोनों जगह पोस्ट एक-एक ही है। इसके अलावा पाली चर्चा केन्द्र, जहाँ पर पांच पोस्ट है, वहाँ पर 330 से 560 का ही ग्रेड दिया हुआ है। जब यू०जी०सी० को लिखा गया तो उन्होंने भी इनके साथ न्याय नहीं किया। कई वर्षों से ये लोग कार्यरत हैं। डा० मन्यक को 25 वर्षों तक लगातार कार्य करने पर भी प्रोमोशन नहीं मिला। इस प्रकार की क्षेत्रीयता और प्रान्तीयता की भावना विश्व-भारती में चलेगी तो इसका ठीक तरह से दृष्टिकोण नहीं बन पाएगा और इसकी कल्पना ही समाप्त हो जाएगी। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय तुरन्त ही इस मामले में सुधार करवायेंगी ताकि जो लोग अपने को अध्ययन, मनन और चिंतन में पचासों वर्षों से खपा रहे हैं, उनको न्याय मिल सके।

श्री मनोरंजन प्रभू (अंडमान और निकोबार द्वीपसमूह) : सभापति महोदय, पहले मैं माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि आज विश्व-कवि रविन्द्र नाथ टैगोर की जन्म-तिथि पर इस सदन में इतने महत्वपूर्ण बिल पर चर्चा की जा रही है। इस चर्चा के पहले मार्क्सवादी सदस्य श्री सत्यसाधन चक्रवर्ती ने कुछ बातें कहीं, टैगोर जी की इतनी प्रशंसा की, इतना ट्रिब्यूट उन्होंने पेश किया, मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ कि इतने दिनों तक जिनको उन्होंने बुजुर्वा कवि माना,

आदर्श की बातें कीं, आज उन्हें क्या हो गया। मैंने कम्युनिस्टों के बारे में यह देखा है कि जिस सिद्धांत को वे मानकर अपना कार्य करते हैं, कुछ समय बाद उसे यह कहकर छोड़ देते हैं कि हम गलती पर थे। आपने बुजुर्वा कवि के बारे में जो बातें कहीं, मैं आपको उनके लिए धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। रविन्द्र नाथ टैगोर को आज भारत में ही नहीं, सारे संसार में विश्व कवि माना जाता है। उन्होंने सारे देश के लोगों के सम्बन्ध में अपने विचार प्रकट किए। जिस समय यहाँ चौबे जी बोल रहे थे, मुझे वह समय याद आया जब वे और उनकी पार्टी के सदस्य मिलकर कहते थे कि यह आजादी झूठी है। मार्क्सवादी पार्टी के एक महत्वपूर्ण सदस्य ने श्री रविन्द्र नाथ टैगोर पर एक आर्टिकल लिखते हुए उन्हें विश्व कवि माना। इसलिए जब आप लोग आजादी के साथ अपने विचार महान रख सकते हैं तो हमें भी अपने विचार रखने की आजादी होनी चाहिए ताकि हम आपकी आलोचना कर सकें। जब ज्वाइंट सर्कट कमेटी में इस बिल पर विचार हो रहा था, तथा लोकसभा और राज्य सभा दोनों के सदस्य मिलकर विचार कर रहे थे तो उसकी रिकमेंडेशन में इनके दल के श्री संतोष मित्र तथा श्री सरदीश राय के डिस्सेंट नोट थे। उनका कहना था कि लोकल एम० पी० को नहीं रखा इसलिए सारी बात गलत हो गई। यदि पंचायत मੈम्बर को रखा जाता तो ठीक हो जाता। चौबे साहब का डिस्सेंट नोट अलग है, मैं उसको फिर दोहराना नहीं चाहता। लेकिन यह बात सही है कि यह बिल काफी पहले आना चाहिए था। फिर भी अब इस सदन में आ गया है तो अच्छी बात है और हमें आज के हालात को देखते हुए, तमाम एजुकेशन इंस्टीट्यूशंस को देखते हुए इस मोके का लाभ अपने अच्छे विचार प्रकट करके उठाना चाहिए। हमारे यहाँ सारी यूनिवर्सिटीज में एक जैसा पढ़ाई का सिस्टम नहीं है एक किस्म के नियम सारी जगह नहीं हैं। यदि हम इस बात पर पहले से ध्यान देते और एजुकेशन को आजादी के बाद सेंट्रल लिस्ट में रखते तो आज शायद इस देश की इतनी बर्बादी न हुई होती। कन्करेंट लिस्ट में आने की वजह से सारे देश में एकता की भावना पैदा नहीं हुई क्योंकि हर एक स्टेट में अपने-अपने

दंग से शिक्षा प्रणाली चल रही है। सारे देश में एक-जैसी व्यवस्था नहीं है। इसलिए मैं माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि इस बिल में उन्होंने जिस तरह से सारे देश की तमाम यूनिवर्सिटीज के लिए विधि अपनाई है, जिसके अनुसार इस देश में शिक्षा की हालत को सुधारा जाएगा, देश में शिक्षा का प्रसार किया जाएगा, उस विधि को आप इस तरीके से बनवाइए... जिससे सारे देश की यूनिवर्सिटीज एक ही नियम के अनुसार चल सकें जिससे देश को लाभ हो सके।

डेमोक्रेसी की जो बात माननीय सत्यसाधन जी कह रहे थे मैं उनको बताऊँ कि आपकी पार्टी के शासन काल में सारी शिक्षण संस्थाओं को कितनी चोट पहुंचाई है, कुछ नहीं कहा जा सकता। कितने ही कालेजों की कमेटियों को भंग करके अपने दल के लोगों को वहाँ बैठाया है। कलकत्ता विश्व-विद्यालय के चांसलर ने जिस वाइस-चांसलर को अपीइंट किया उसके साथ आप जो बर्ताव कर रहे हैं वह शोभा की बात नहीं है। इसलिए शिक्षा व्यवस्था पर जितनी चोट आपने पहुंचाई है सारी जगह नौमीनेशन से आपने भरी हैं चाहे वह सैक्रेडरी ऐजुकेशन बोर्ड हो, या इंटरमीडिएट बोर्ड, सभी जगह नौमीनेशन से अपने आदमी भरे हैं और यहाँ सदन में डेमोक्रेसी की बात करते हैं जो शोभा नहीं देता है।

यह बिल समर्थन योग्य है और सारे देश के लिए एक ही किस्म का विधेयक होना चाहिए जिससे एक-सी व्यवस्था हो सके। राजनीतिक उद्देश्य की प्राप्ति के लिए जो काम हो रहा है उसको तभी रोक सकते हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ और आपको अवसर देने के लिए धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Narayan Choubey.

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL : Mr. Chairman, Sir, he is a Member of this Com-

mittee and I do not think that the rules would allow him to speak on this Bill.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : I have given a note of dissent.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is no bar. You can speak.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, SPORTS AND WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI BUTA SINGH) : Sir, we have already taken the time allotted for this Bill. Therefore, I would request you kindly to tell the speakers to be brief in their speeches. They should only make points, not speeches. Otherwise, all other business will be held up.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore) : Sir, I heard with rapt attention the speeches made by the hon. Members of this House. Sir, Tagore had sung—

Puraba Paschima Ashe
 Taba Singhasan Pashe

He wanted to see that the East and the West sit by the two sides of the throne of India. Many things have been told about Tagore. Tagore was never static ; Tagore was a living dynamic being. What Tagore was in the early part of 20th Century was not the same Tagore when the British people were crushing our national struggle in 1920's. When Jalianwallah Bagh massacre took place, Tagore was not the same Tagore and when the Second World War started in 1939, Tagore was not the same Tagore. These people always try to prove that Tagore was something like Lord Mahadev, without any change, which is not so. Tagore was for 'shanti', was for peace, was for 'Kshema', was for many of these good things.

But Tagore had to say :

जाहारा तोमार विषाई छे वायु,
 निभाई छे तब आलो,
 तुमि कि तादेर करियाछ क्षमा,
 तुमि कि बेशेछ मालो ।

"Those people are vitiating your atmos-

[Shri Narayan Choubey]

phere, do you love them ? Do you ever forgive them ?" Tagore had put this question. And today, these gentlemen are shedding crocodile tears for Tagore. Tagore was a democrat. He was a democrat from top to bottom. I am not questioning those gentlemen.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may say hon. members instead of gentlemen.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : We are not questioning this Bill. We have questioned certain principles of this Bill. Tagore was a democrat. Now who would represent the students ? We elect our President, yes. We elect our Prime Minister, yes, that is true. But students are not allowed to elect their representatives. Teachers are not allowed to elect their representatives. So, this is your Bill. Otherwise, many things are okay there.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : It is a perverse Bill.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : I have heard what Prof. Ranga was saying. While Prof. Ranga was bringing students out of the Universities, that was all right because that was Independence time, time for struggling for Independence. Many of us have done these things during the struggle for Independence. But when Capitalism sits on the throne and when the Left wants to bring capitalism down and when we give a call to the students to fight this demon of capitalism, then it is wrong. I do not agree with it.

SHRI BUTA SINGH : It has been demolished in Calcutta.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Until we demolish it in Delhi, we will fight.

I do not agree with Prof. Ranga. I have heard with rapt attention Shri Bhagawanji also. He may call me Choubey or Dubey or whatever. He is a great man. He is very much annoyed because Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty had asked something regarding

Prime Minister. He is a ** of Prime Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You should not say that, please withdraw it.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : I withdrew it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is a gentleman. He withdrew it.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : But Sir, what more can I expect from Shri Bhagawanji.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Kindly confine yourself to the Bill.

आचार्य भगवान देव : सभापति महोदय, इन को यहां स्पष्ट करना चाहिए। इन शब्दों का क्या संबंध है, यहां जो बात कहना चाहते हैं, स्पष्ट करें। इन्हें हाउस में इस बात को स्पष्ट करना चाहिए। ये यहां इस प्रकार से अच्छी बात नहीं करते हैं।

बात खूलकर कहें और उसका जवाब सुनने के लिए ये तैयार रहें।

श्री रशीद मसूद : स्पष्ट है।

(شری رشید مسعود : اسبٹ ہے۔)

आचार्य भगवान देव : क्या स्पष्ट है ? बोलिए।

(Interruptions)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : I only want to remind our friends here that after the Jalianwalabagh massacre Tagore who was given a Knighthood by the British Government, renounced it. Much before the Congress people could think of it, Tagore wanted to take a Jatha to Punjab. It was accepted by the then Congress Party. Anyhow, in the next Working Committee meeting of the Congress Party, certain leaders of the Congress Party wanted to pass

a resolution to congratulate Tagore for renouncing the Knighthood. But this was objected to by some Rightist Congress people and the resolution was not passed. It was killed in silence. This is what the Congress people who had high praise for Tagore had done.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Kindly confine to the Bill.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : I am only saying that the Congress people are saying that from a to z it is a model Bill, and that this Bill should be the model for all Universities and for all campuses, so that they can control all the Universities from Delhi. (*Interruptions*) All will be dethroned. You will also be gone. Don't worry.

I tell you that my motherland India is not England. It is not France. It is multi-national, multi-lingual. (*Interruptions*) Yes ; it is multi-national and multi-lingual. That is the thing you object to. This India is a multi-cultural country. If you want to say that all of us should take *charchari* or *dhaniya-patta* throughout the length and breadth of the country, i.e. everywhere, it will not suit the cause. We have many types of people.

"Nana bhasha nana mat,
Nana Paridhan
Bibidher Majhe Dheko
Milan Mahan."

In other words, we have unity in diversity. So, naturally the prescription which they are giving for Mother India's education system will simply lack these things. So, we oppose this Bill ; but at the same time we request them to consider whether this elective system which we had proposed, can even now be restored.

I again appeal to her for these things ; and I now finish. Thank you.

श्री गिरधारी लाल डोगरा (जम्मू) : जनाबे साहबे-सदर, मैं आपका मशकूर हूँ कि आपने मुझे मोका दिया ।

अगर हमने यूनिवर्सिटी को तालीम का मरकज

बनाना है, तो हमें एक तरीका अपनाना पड़ेगा । अगर हमने उसे एजीटेशन का मरकज बनाना है तो फिर कोई दूसरा तरीका अपनाना पड़ेगा । अगर हम टैगोर की कायम की हुई यूनिवर्सिटी को इस तरह चलायेंगे कि स्टूडेंट्स फंसला करें कि उनके टीचर कौन होंगे, कौन सी किताबें होंगी और एग्जामिनेशन कैसे होगा, तो वह कैसे चल सकेगी । श्री चौबे यूनिवर्सिटी में डेमोक्रेसी लाना चाहते हैं । जायंट कमेटी ने जो रिपोर्ट दी है, वह उसको भी मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं है । अगर यूनिवर्सिटी को इल्म और विद्या का मरकज बनाना है, तो इस बारे में एजुकेशनिस्ट्स की राय पर अमल करना होगा । सब यूनिवर्सिटीज के लिए सिस्टम एक होना चाहिए और इस सिलसिले में लोकल कंडी-शंज और ट्रेडीशन्ज वगैरह को ध्यान में रखना चाहिए ।

हमारा इरादा स्टूडेंट्स को बांध कर रखने का नहीं है । हम यह भी नहीं कहते कि इख्तलाफ-राय नहीं होना चाहिए । लेकिन ऐसा तो नहीं होना चाहिए कि स्टूडेंट्स यह तय करें कि उनके लिए किताबें कौन सी होनी चाहिए, करीकलम क्या होना चाहिए वगैरह । जब हम यूनिवर्सिटी में पढ़ते थे, तो बैस्ट स्टूडेंट को कनसल्ट किया जाता था । एक बार लॉ कालेज में स्टूडेंट्स ने स्ट्राइक कर दी । प्रिंसिपल ने बैस्ट स्टूडेंट को बुलाकर कनसल्ट किया । जो स्टूडेंट पढ़ता है, वह जानता है कि एजुकेशन में इम्प्रूवमेंट के लिए क्या करना चाहिए । जो सिर्फ एजीटेशन करता है, उसको क्या मालूम कि इल्म को कैसे आगे बढ़ाना है । यह तो बिल्कुल उलटी बात कही जा रही है कि एजीटेंटज यह फंसला करें कि यूनिवर्सिटी का निजाम क्या होना चाहिए । हमारी परम्परा रही है कि जब स्टूडेंट्स अपनी एजुकेशन पूरी कर लेते हैं, तो उन्हें लिबर्टी दी जाती है कि वे अपने ख्यालात का खुल कर इजहार करें । हमारे यहां टीचर शिक्षा देने में और स्टूडेंट्स की पर्सनेलिटी को डेवलप करने में मदद करते थे ।

हमारे ये दोस्त किसानों और मजदूरों में काम नहीं करेंगे, एकसप्लायटेशन के खिलाफ नहीं

[श्री गिरधारी लाल डोगरा]

लड़ेंगे, मगर स्टुडेंट्स को उकसायेंगे। कोई नहीं कहता कि आप स्टुडेंट्स में न जाइये या उनको एजूकेट न कीजिए लेकिन यूनिवर्सिटी का जो मैनेजमेंट है और उसके लिए जो एक रास्ता अपनाया है उसमें आप स्टुडेंट्स से इण्टरफीयर करवाना चाहते हैं—यह मुनासिब नहीं होगा। मैं एजूकेशन मिनिस्टर से दरख्वास्त करूंगा कि तमाम मुल्क में चांसलर और वाइस चांसलर के एग्जाइन्टमेंट और उनकी फंक्शनिंग का एक ही तरीका होना चाहिए और उसमें पालिटिक्स नहीं आनी चाहिए। आज तो हम देखते हैं कि यूनिवर्सिटीज एजिटेशन की सेन्टर बन गई है और उसकी वजह से तमाम उसका ढांचा ही बिखर रहा है। इससे सारा देश आज सफर कर रहा है और हमारा जो पुराना सिस्टम था एजूकेशन का उसके स्टैंडर्ड में कमी आ रही है। हालांकि आप नया करीकुलम बना रहे हैं और नई बातें रख रहे हैं लेकिन मेरी गुजारिश है कि आज बुनियाद बहुत आगे बढ़ रही है इसलिए तालीम को भी बहुत आगे ले जाना होगा ताकि हमारे जो स्टुडेंट्स हैं वह भी तरक्की कर सकें। आज हम देखते हैं कि स्टुडेंट्स की तादाद तो बढ़ी है लेकिन जो एजिटेटर्स होते हैं वे जैसा चाहें वैसा ही चलाते हैं। यहां दिल्ली की दो यूनिवर्सिटीज में भी हमने देखा है कि पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू के नाम पर जो यूनिवर्सिटी बनी थी, वहां पर ऐसे कुछ लोग बैठ गये हैं जो सैबटांज करते रहते हैं। और जो दूसरी यूनिवर्सिटी है उसमें भी कुछ दूसरी तरफ के लोग बैठे हैं जोकि चल्नन ही नहीं देते हैं। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ आप को कोई नया सिस्टम लागू करना होगा। आज हमारे वाइस प्रेसीडेंट शायद विज़िटर हैं, दोनों यूनिवर्सिटीज के लोग होंगे, लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि दोनों ही यूनिवर्सिटीज ठीक ढंग से नहीं चल रही हैं। इसकी वजह से सारा मुल्क सफर कर रहा है, हमारे देश के नौजवान सफर कर रहे हैं।

16.02 hrs.

(SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE in
the Chair)

स्टुडेंट्स रोते हैं, वे एम० फिल करना चाहते

हैं लेकिन उनको एडमीशन नहीं मिल पाता। वे इन्तहान भी पास कर लेते हैं लेकिन प्रोफसर उन को दाखिला नहीं देते हैं। दाखिला भी अगर हो गया तो उनको पढ़ाते नहीं है।

ऐसी हालत में मेरी आपसे गुजारिश है कि आपको कोई नया सिस्टम इंट्रोड्यूस करना चाहिए और इस सिलसिले में स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स से सलाह-मश्विरा करनी चाहिए ताकि यूनिवर्सिटीज की फंक्शनिंग प्रापर हो सके और उनका डेवलपमेंट हो सके तथा हमारा देश तरक्की कर सके। इस की जिम्मेदारी आपके ऊपर ही है और अगर आप इस जिम्मेदारी से भागेंगे तो आने वाली नस्लें आपको माफ नहीं करेंगी। बस इतना ही मैं आपसे दरख्वास्त करना चाहता था—बाकी आप जानें और आपका काम।

श्री हरिकेश बहादुर (गोरखपुर) : माननीय सभापति जी, विश्व भारती के बारे में जो विधेयक यहां पर प्रस्तुत किया गया है उसका एक विशेष तथ्य के आधार पर मैं विरोध करना चाहता हूँ वैसे विधेयक का यहां पर लाया जाना बहुत अच्छी बात है, हम भी चाहते थे कि जल्दी से जल्दी यह विधेयक यहां पर लाया जाए। लेकिन इसके अतिरिक्त दूसरे केन्द्रीय विश्वविद्यालय भी हैं जैसे कि बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय के बारे में बराबर मांग होती रही है कि यहां पर विधेयक लाया जाए लेकिन वह नहीं लाया गया है। मैं सरकार से विशेष रूप से प्रार्थना करना चाहूंगा कि बनारस विश्वविद्यालय के बारे में भी विधेयक लाया जाए क्योंकि इस समय का जो एक्ट है उसके अन्तर्गत वाइस चांसलर को बहुत सारे अधिकार दे दिए गए हैं और जैसा वह चाहते हैं वैसा करते हैं। इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि बनारस विश्वविद्यालय के लिए भी विधेयक लाया जाए; तो विधेयक यहां पर लाए जाने का हम स्वागत करते हैं लेकिन विधेयक कैसा होना चाहिए, इस सम्बन्ध में हमारा थोड़ा सा विरोध है। ऐसा नहीं दिखार्द देता है कि यह लोक-तांत्रिक विधेयक है। शिक्षा संस्थाओं से संबंधित जो भी विधेयक हो उसमें लोकतांत्रिक मर्यादाओं और मूल्यों का विशेष ध्यान

रखा जाना चाहिए। यह बात इसमें दिखाई नहीं देती है। गुरुदेव रवीन्द्र नाथ टैगोर के आदर्शों, मान्यताओं और लोकतन्त्र के प्रति उनकी निष्ठा को सभी लोग जानते हैं। इसलिए यह विधेयक उनके आदर्शों के अनुरूप, उनकी इच्छा के अनुरूप और उनकी प्रवृत्ति के अनुरूप आना चाहिए था। इस विधेयक में कोर्ट में नोमिनेशन की बात कही गई है। छात्र प्रतिनिधियों और कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधि के बारे में मैं सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। यह नोमिनेशन के आधार पर नहीं बल्कि चुनाव के आधार पर होना चाहिए। उसी प्रकार अध्यापक का प्रतिनिधित्व चुनाव के आधार पर होना चाहिए, जो कि इस विधेयक में नहीं है। इसलिए मैं विशेष रूप से सरकार से मांग करूँगा कि वह अभी भी इस विधेयक के बारे में इन सुझावों पर ध्यान दे। जहाँ कहीं भी नोमिनेशन की प्रक्रिया है, उसे चुनाव की प्रक्रिया के रूप में बदलने का प्रयास करे। अगर हम विश्वविद्यालयों का प्रबन्ध लोक दान्त्रिक तरीके से नहीं कर सकते हैं, तो हम और क्या करेंगे? विश्वविद्यालयों में यदि अयोग्य व्यक्ति बैठे हुए होंगे और इस बात का भी भरोसा नहीं होगा कि वे संस्था को लोकतांत्रिक तरीके से चला सकें, तो किस पर हम भरोसा कर सकते हैं। हमने तमाम ऐसे लोगों को अधिकार दे दिए हैं जो अनपढ़ हैं, बहुत कम पढ़े लिखे हैं। हम शिक्षाविदों की संस्थाओं को लोकतन्त्र के माध्यम से चलाए जाने का अधिकार नहीं देना चाहते हैं, यह एक बहुत ही दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण स्थिति है। इसलिए मेरे सुझाव पर विचार किया जाएगा, इसका मैं विशेष रूप से आग्रह करता हूँ।

उपकुलपतियों के चुनाव से संबंधित एक प्रश्न भी पूछा गया और सुझाव दिया गया कि सभी केन्द्रीय विश्वविद्यालयों के बाइस चांसलर के चुनने की एक ही प्रणाली होनी चाहिए। यदि इस प्रकार की कोई व्यवस्था इस विधेयक में होती तो मैं उस का विरोध नहीं करता। हम चाहते हैं कि हर एक विश्वविद्यालय की कोर्ट को यह अधिकार दिया जाना चाहिए कि वह वाइस चांसलर चुन सके। भले ही इसके लिए वहाँ की एकेडेमिक काउन्सिल को वाइस चांसलर की योग्यता पहले से निर्धारित

करनी पड़े। जैसे यदि किसी ने बीस वर्ष तक कम-से-कम अध्यापन का कार्य नहीं किया है, वह वाइस चांसलर नहीं हो सकता है। इसी प्रकार पांच वर्ष तक जिसने प्रोफेसर के पद पर कार्य नहीं किया है, वह वाइस चांसलर नहीं हो सकता है। इस प्रकार की योग्यतायें एकेडेमिक काउन्सिल द्वारा पहले से निर्धारित कर दी जायें। इसके आधार पर वहाँ के कुलपति का चुनाव किया जाए, यह हम चाहते हैं। इस प्रकार का प्रावधान होना चाहिए।

इसी प्रकार चांसलर के चुनाव के लिए मैं सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। तमाम विश्वविद्यालयों के चांसलर इस प्रकार के चुन लिए जाते हैं, जो अच्छी तरह पढ़े-लिखे नहीं होते हैं। कम से कम चांसलर तो विश्वविद्यालयों के पढ़े-लिखे होने चाहिए। ऐसे लोग जो कम से कम ग्रेजुएट हों उन्हीं को चांसलर चुना जाना चाहिए। जिसको चाहते हैं, उसको बना देते हैं, यह व्यवस्था अच्छी नहीं है। इसलिए इस प्रकार की स्थिति होनी चाहिए जो व्यक्ति ग्रेजुएट नहीं है, वह किसी भी विश्वविद्यालय का चांसलर न चुना जाए। विश्व भारती के चांसलर और बाइस चांसलर गुरुदेव रवीन्द्र नाथ टैगोर की योग्यता और सहायता को देखते हुए चुना जाना चाहिए। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इन तमाम सुझावों पर ध्यान दे और स्थिति में सुधार करे। इसके साथ ही मैं पुनः इस बात की जोरदार मांग करना चाहता हूँ कि बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय के बारे में भी एक बिल शीघ्र ही सदन में प्रस्तुत किया जाना चाहिए।

श्री चन्द्रपाल शैलानी(हाथरस) : सभापति जी, मैं इस विश्वभारती संशोधन विधेयक का स्वागत करता हूँ, समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं माननीया विद्वान शिक्षा मंत्री जी को भी धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि वह इस महान संस्था की बिगड़ती हुई हालत को सुधारने के लिए इतना अच्छा, प्रभावी और सुन्दर बिल लेकर आई हैं। श्रीमन्, जिस संयुक्त प्रवर ससिति को यह बिल सौंपा गया था, मैं भी उसका एक सदस्य था और यह मेरे लिए एक सौभाग्य की बात थी। लगभग तीन वर्षों के कठोर परिश्रम के

[श्री चन्द्रपाल शैलानी]

बाद यह समिति अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश कर सकी। यह समिति दो बार शान्तिनिकेतन गई, गुजरात गई तथा अन्य कई स्थानों पर गई और सभी संस्थाओं का गहन अध्ययन करने के बाद जो बिल यहां पेश किया गया उसका दोनों पक्षों के साथियों ने समर्थन किया है—यह बहुत स्वागत योग्य बात है।

श्रीमत्, जब हम इस महान संस्था के सम्बन्ध में विचार करते हैं तो अनायास ही हमें भारत के उस महान सपूत का स्मरण हो आता है जो शिक्षा, संस्कृति, कला, लेखन, संगीत, आदि अनेक क्षेत्रों में बहुमुखी प्रतिभा के धनी थे और जिन्होंने न केवल भारत बल्कि पूरे संसार में देश का नाम रोशन किया—उस महान सपूत का नाम था—गुरुदेव रविन्द्र नाथ ठाकुर। जिस कल्पना और जिस आशा को लेकर गुरुदेव ने इस संस्था की स्थापना की, मैं ऐसा सोचता हूँ कि वैसे तो भारत में शिक्षा के बहुत से केन्द्र हैं, संस्थाएँ हैं, लेकिन गुरुदेव एक भिन्न प्रकार की संस्था की कल्पना करते थे जो इस देश की सभ्यता, संस्कृति, कला को बढ़ाने के लिए एक आदर्श केन्द्र स्थापित हो। यदि मैं यह कहूँ कि उनकी मंशा थी कि वह नालंदा और तक्षशिला जैसे विश्वविद्यालयों के आधार पर एक विद्यालय स्थापित करना चाहते थे तो वह गलत नहीं होगा। वे विश्वविद्यालय किसी जमाने में बुनियाद के देशों को अपनी ओर आकर्षित करते थे। आपको याद होगा—भारत की सभ्यता और संस्कृति सीखने के लिए नालंदा और तक्षशिला में विद्यार्थी विदेशों से आये करते थे। गुरुदेव की भी यही कल्पना थी कि एक ऐसी संस्था संस्थापित की जाय जिसमें विदेशों से लोग आकर यहां की कला, शिक्षा और कल्चर को अच्छी तरह से समझें, पढ़ें और अपने देशों में जाकर भारत का नाम रोशन करें, भारत का गुणगान करें। लेकिन पिछले दिनों उस विश्वविद्यालय में काफी गड़बड़ हुई। खास तौर से 1971 और 1972 में जो आन्दोलन हुए, तोड़फोड़ हुई, विद्यार्थी और अध्यापकों में आपस में जो झगड़े हुए वे गुरुदेव की इस संस्था को देखते हुए मैं समझता हूँ बहुत अशोभनीय बात थी।

दिन-प्रति-दिन उसकी हालत बिगड़ती चली जा रही थी। तब सरकार ने सोचा कि उसकी दशा को सुधारने के लिए क्यों न ऐसा विधेयक लाया जाय जिससे यह संस्था अपने पूर्व गौरव को प्राप्त कर सके।

हमारी प्रवर समिति जब शान्तिनिकेतन गई तो हम वहां सभी वर्गों के लोगों से मिले। वाइस-चांसलर से मिले, उनके विचार सुने, अध्यापकों के विचार सुने, विद्यार्थियों के विचार सुने और विश्वविद्यालय के जो कर्मचारी थे उनके विचार भी सुने। उन सबके विचार सुनने के बाद उनकी भावनाओं और मंशाओं के अनुरूप कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश की और उसके बाद यह विधेयक पेश किया गया। वहां पर लोकतंत्र नहीं था। इस बात को सुनकर तब हंसी आती है जब मार्क्सवादी लोग इस तरह की बात करते हैं जिनका लोकतंत्र में विश्वास ही नहीं है। हमारी सरकार चाहती है, हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री चाहते हैं कि वहां पर लोकतंत्र कायम रहे और उस विश्वविद्यालय का उद्देश्य आगे बढ़े। विधेयक में इसके लिए विभिन्न प्रकार के प्रावधान किए गए हैं। तीन व्यक्तियों की समिति बनाई गई है जो इस चीज को देखेगी। किम तरह से वहां पर अनुशासनहीनता का रोक जा सकता है। किस तरह से विद्यार्थियों और अध्यापकों के टकराव को रोक जा सकता है।

सभापति महोदय, वहां पर शांति निकेतन है जहां पर पढ़ने और पढ़ाने का काम होता है। श्री निकेतन में रूरल डेवलपमेंट और कृषि के विकास के लिए, कला के विकास के लिए व्यवस्था है। इस बिल में जो प्रावधान किए गए हैं उनसे वहां पर आई अस्वाभाविकता को दूर किया जा सकेगा। अगर इन प्रावधानों को सही रूप में लागू किया गया तो मेरा विश्वास है कि गुरुदेव की कल्पना साकार होगी। वहां पर एक आदर्श रहा है। शुरू में वहां पर पढ़ों के नीचे बैठकर विद्यार्थी शिक्षा ग्रहण करते थे। गुरुओं का आदर करते थे। वही आदर और सत्कार पुनः स्थापित होगा ऐसी मुझे आशा है। इस महान संस्था को पुनः प्राचीन काल का महत्व प्राप्त होगा। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI A. K. ROY (Dhanbad) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, as you will not give me more time, I like to pinpoint certain features of *Visva-Bharati*. *Visva-Bharati* is not situated in a very grand place. There are no beautiful hills, no sea shore, it is not a holiday resort. It was a dry land, hot area, barren land and there were no gentlemen, no *shadra* log living around it except the tribals and the poorest people. While passing through that area, the father of Rabindranath, Maharshi Debendra Nath sat below a tree and that particular place attracted him. Gradually, in 1900 he purchased some land and in 1901 a small school and in 1921 a national institution was established which was made a national university in 1951. While piloting his Bill, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the then Education Minister referred that this is an *amanat*, a gift, which Gandhiji entrusted on him to watch. This is from the report of the Masood Committee. Nehruji, intervening in the debate, said that this university must not be allowed to be another university in a regimented form just like other universities.

He warned against regimentation. But today we are faced with the worst regimented legislation that is before us. Even the Masood Committee recommendations said in the Aims and Objects that that they are giving a legal form, an Act form to the Report of their Committee. But the Masood Committee also recommended that the students should be elected, the teachers should also be elected, because you have got enough powers otherwise. That too you have avoided. It was discussed that good students should be inducted into the committees. It should have been the best thing that the good students should also be the leaders of the students. If this combination is not there today, for that we need not blame the students and that cannot be corrected by withdrawing the right of election. For that we must admit that somehow or other we have failed in our duty that there is no ideal before the students. Now we have read in the Memoirs of Prof. Woten that when some controversy arose, Subhash Chandra Bose was not the person who assaulted him, but he took the total responsibility and got himself expelled. It is true that we should not be afraid of agitations. Today the problem is not of the students'

agitation, but the problem is that of the direction of the agitation. In our time we have never seen that the students were agitating for hard question papers or that there should not be invigilators. All sorts of such things were not there then. My Comrade Choubey said that students were fighting to pull down the demand of capitalism. But I doubt whether it is a fact. The students are not fighting for that. That would have been the best thing if the students had come to fight the demand of capitalism, the demand of casteism or the demand of communalism. Today in which direction have we led the country that the students are becoming extremists in Punjab? They try not to become Bhagat Singh, who was more radical than the old Congressmen. They are two steps backward. In Tripura what happened? All the tribals above 40 years are with the CPI(M) and below 20 years are with the Tripura Yuva Samiti.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRIES OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI P.K. THUNGON) : I don't think so.

SHRI A.K. ROY : You may not. But if you think with honesty, then you will think like that. But my point is what is the contribution? I am saying that that trend you cannot arrest by withdrawing the right of election.

Secondly, I would like to say, what is the purpose of creating a Shriniketan besides the Shantiniketan. One of the biggest imbalances in our education system is the alienation of the intellectual exercise from physical labour. That Gandhiji also understood. Rabindranath Tagore also understood and all the national leaders understood that in no way alienation between the mental and physical work should be allowed to happen. That is why Rabindranath Tagore invited one of the renowned agricultural experts at Sriniketan and rural technology was established there. It is all right that you have withdrawn the right to election. By that can you keep the ideals of Tagore living in your Amended Act? There should be some sort of provision even in your aims and Objects that the relation of mental and physical work and the origi-

[Shri A.K. Roy]

nal ideas should not be lost sight of. You have seen that in many of these witnesses. I was studying the deliberations of the witnesses.

They say that one of the reasons is that Visva-Bharati went in the wrong direction because Sriniketan was neglected. You have neglected the rural technology, you have neglected the practical work, you have neglected your integration with the society. I tell you that if surrounding villages are inhabited by the tribals, the poorest of the poor people, you neglected that portion. So you must emphasise that point. Mr. Vajpayee is sitting here, I was reading his performance in the Committee. (*Interruptions*). His performance was fairly good. He asked, 'What is the number of foreign students in the University?' The University is having 400 teachers and 3000 students. The total number of foreign students is 50. The number of foreign teachers is less, but that was not the original conception. But why is this name 'Visva-Bharati'? Rabindranath Tagore started Visva-Bharati with C.F. Andrews, W.W. Pearson and Kaka Saheb Kalelkar of Maharashtra, actually collecting people from all over India, and that character must be retained. Prof. Ranga suggested panels and all that saying that one should be from Bengal, one should be from other States and all that. I say that a panel of three should be for Visva-Bharati—one from Bengal, one from India other than from Bengal and one should be from a foreign country. These panels should be there and out of that a Vice-Chancellor or Upacharya should be selected. Then you can give a real meaning to the term, 'Visva-Bharati'. Your reservation should be there—1/3rd of the students from Visva-Bharati should be from Bengal, one-third should be from other States of India and the rest of the one-third should be from outside India. The composition of teachers also should be like that. That should be enforced. In this way you can, to some extent, preserve some of the good elements with which Rabindranath Tagore conceived this institution.

श्री मूल चन्द्र डामा(पाली) : सभापति महोदय, आज यदि किसी देश का भविष्य आंकना हो तो

उसके विश्वविद्यालयों से आंका जा सकता है। यदि संसार का भविष्य आंकना हो तो उसके आंकने का एक ही मापदण्ड है और वह विश्व भरती जैसी संस्थाओं से आंका जा सकता है। जब इस बिल पर हमारे वक्ता महोदय पहले बोल रहे थे तो उससे स्पष्ट नहीं होता था कि वे क्या संशोधन इस बिल में चाहते हैं, किस बात पर जोर देना चाहते हैं। किस तरह की डैमोक्रेसी चाहते हैं। यदि आप स्टूडेंट्स के बारे में ज्यादा जोर देकर कहना चाहते हैं तो आप इस क्लोज को क्या कहेंगे—इससे ज्यादा आप क्या चाहते हैं—

"There shall be constituted a Students Council consisting of :

- (i) the Director of Physical Education, Sports, National Service and Students Welfare—Chairman.

+ + +

- (ii) All students who have won prizes in the fields of studies, fine arts, sports, extension work or any other prizes at the level of Class X and above."

इसमें वही विद्यार्थी लिए जाएंगे जो प्रथम श्रेणी के विद्यार्थी होंगे और उनकी सारी क्वालिटीज इसमें लिखी हुई हैं—

Is it not an election? This is also a method of election.

इसलिए आप ऐसा मत कहिए कि इसको खत्म कर दीजिए—

"All students who have won prizes in the fields of studies, fine arts, sports, extension work or any other prizes at the level of Class X and above."

+

Is it not an election?

क्या यह चुनाव नहीं है? राष्ट्रपति को कौन चुनता है? देश की सर्वोच्च संस्था के सदस्य चुनते हैं और उसमें कोई तानाशाही नहीं है। आप संशोधन 10 देखें :

"Subject to the provisions of subsection (3) and (4), the Paridarsaka (Visitor) shall have the right to cause an inspection to be made, by such person or persons as he may specify, of the University, its buildings,..."

"The Paridarsaka (Visitor) shall give notice to the University of his intention to cause an inspection or enquiry to be made and the University shall on receipt of such notice have the right to make within thirty days or such other period as the Paridarsaka (Visitor) may determine, from the date of receipt of the notice,"

So, nothing is being done which is undemocratic.

राष्ट्रपति को तो सर्वोच्च संस्था के सदस्य चुनते हैं। आपने क्या किया कि गवर्नर ने वाइस-चांसलर को अपीइंट किया तो आप ऐसा बिल ला रहे हैं व्हेट बंगाल में जिसके द्वारा चांसलर की सारी पावर्स को खत्म करना चाहते हैं। आप तो वहाँ चाहते हैं कि गवर्नर को कोई अधिकार न रहे। जो अनुभव का लाभ उठाकर आगे नहीं बढ़ता उसको क्या कहा जाए। आपने कहीं स्टूडेंट्स का चुनाव होना चाहिए। क्या चुनाव ही राजनीति है। आजकल दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय में जो चुनाव होते हैं क्या आप नहीं जानते हैं कि किस प्रकार के काम वहाँ होते हैं? क्या जबाहर लाल नेहरू यूनिवर्सिटी की बात आप नहीं जानते हैं? क्या हमने कुछ बातें सीखी नहीं? एक मनीषी और दार्शनिक ने एक बात कही थी, उसकी भावना थी और उसको असली रूप इस बिल द्वारा दिखा गया है। इसके ओब्जेक्ट्स में जो बात कही गई है, मेरे मथ में एक शंका होती है :

"(i) to study the mind of Man in its realisation of different aspects of truth from diverse points of view".

कितने सुन्दर ओब्जेक्ट्स रखे हैं। लेकिन इन उद्देश्यों को रखने के बाद मेरे मन में एक शंका होती है :

The legislation of Parliament must not

contain something which cannot be enforced.

इतने ऊँचे उद्देश्य हैं, लेकिन अगर लेजिस्लेशन में ऐसे ओब्जेक्ट्स रख दें जो एनफोर्स नहीं किए जा सकते हैं तो कैसे काम चलेगा ?

उधर के माननीय सदस्य डिप्टी के बारे में बात कर रहे थे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या टैगोर बी० ए०, एम० ए० थे। बाल्मीकि ने रामायण लिखी क्या वह बहुत विद्वान थे? क्या रैदास बहुत विद्वान थे ?

मेरी राय में यह एक मॉडल बिल है और तमाम यूनिवर्सिटीज के लिए एक नया बिल आना चाहिए जिसमें विद्यार्थियों और टीचर्स के चुनाव बन्द होने की बात हो और नए तरीके से विश्वविद्यालय शिक्षा को सेंटर का विषय बनाना चाहिए।

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the outset, let me make it clear that we are not opposed to the objective of the Bill which seeks to preserve the uniqueness and distinctiveness of Visva-Bharati. But we have certain opposition regarding certain modalities that have been incorporated in this Bill itself.

To be very brief, I would only like to quote what Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru said about this Visva-Bharati because that will clear the mist which might have gathered in those who are now ruling in the Government corridors. The Prime Minister Jawahar Lal Nehru said :

"We have looked upon this not only as a very great institution but as a very special and unique institution, and we are particularly anxious that it should not fall into the rut of other Universities. We are anxious, if I may say so, that our Education Department should not try to bring regimentation of it in line with others".

Sir, is it not clear? He definitely wanted that Education Department should not interfere or should not create a condition which leads to regimentation. It is not I,

[Shri Chitta Basu]

nor Mr. Satyasadhan Chakraborty who is speaking. It is your Prime Minister, the most beloved Prime Minister of this country who made this observation while taking part in the debate. My question to the hon. Education Minister is, has she got the courage to denounce it? If she has got, let her denounce it and let us be happy.

AN HON. MEMBER : They have already denounced.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Let her say so.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (New Delhi) : Why denounce let them only depart.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : It is nothing but denunciation of the objective, of the observation that has been made. Of course, my hon. friend Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty has used certain language. But denunciation, I think, is stronger than what he has used. They are denouncing themselves. They are denouncing their leader. That is the whole crux of the thing.

But in the Bill, there is a positive progress—that is, the ideal of Rabindra Nath Tagore has been included in the body of the Bill which was not done earlier. This is a significant one. But I feel and I think, many of you may agree with me that the draft of that objective is not comprehensive enough to include the various facets of the philosophy of Kabir, Guru Rabindranath. Time is very short at my disposal and, therefore, I cannot discuss all those aspects which have not found proper reflection in the embodiment of that objective. I would only like to mention two aspects. The concept of national unity of Rabindranath is, in fact, recognised as unity in diversity and that has found reflection in one of his great poems :

हेषाय आर्यं हेषाय अनार्यं
हेषाय द्राविड़ चीन
शक हुन दल, पाठान मोगल
एक देहे होली लीन ।

This is the concept of Indian unity in diver-

sity. In the present context of India's politics, this very fundamental concept of Indian unity in diversity is being eroded. And that concept does not find proper place in the embodiment of the objective of the University as has been done here.

Another aspect I would like to mention about Rabindranath is that he was not an advocate of internationalism alone. His internationalism was based on a strong sense of nationalism and that has found expression in the following objectives of Visva-Bharati set up by him.

"Visva-Bharati represents India where she has her wealth of mind which is for all. Visva-Bharati acknowledges India's obligation to offer two objects: To others the hospitality of her best culture and, India's right to accept from others what is best."

Therefore, this is a synthesis between Indian nationalism and internationalism. We have to accept what is best in other countries and we have also the obligation to give what is best in us.

This spirit, according to me, has not found proper reflection in that Chapter.

Now, coming to the question of regimentation, I have to say that the objective of this Bill is nothing but to encroach on the autonomy of the educational institutions.

This Bill causes greater concern and apprehension for us when I find that respectable and veteran Members of the Congress—like Prof. N.G. Ranga try to mis-interpret the content of democracy.

Prof. N.G. Ranga says that democracy is good for certain areas and for certain institutions and that there are certain institutions where democracy is not required and is not advisable.

I only want to remind him of what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said about it :

"Freedom is indivisible. Democracy is indivisible."

And here I find Prof. N.G. Ranga saying as

if he can divide democracy ! This is the concept, this is the philosophy, this is the strain which cannot but create not only misgivings but apprehension in the minds of all democratic-loving people of our country.

This kind of theory is further reiterated by a chorus right from Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev to the hon. Member from Andaman and Nicobar that this should be a model Bill for all the Universities. The cat is out of the bag! Their real intention is that they want to negate the Calcutta University Bill passed by the West Bengal Legislative Assembly and they know that this law made by Parliament under the concurrent subject prevails over the State law. Therefore, they have chosen this time for passing this law. This is my interpretation.

MR. CHAIRMAN : This is your view.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Anyway. This is my interpretation. You are entitled to have your own interpretation. The whole trend of the Government is in favour of encroaching on the autonomy of educational institutions.

Some charges have been made against the Left Front Government of West Bengal by taking advantage of this discussion over the Bill.

The charges are that the West Bengal Left Front Government have removed the works of Rabindranath Tagore from the curriculum of schools and colleges. This is a blatant lie, this is nothing but a canard, this is nothing but maligning of a government which is different in political complexion. As a matter of fact, the House should know that the West Bengal Government has published the entire works of Rabindranath Tagore in Bengali and they are being sold at a cheaper rate.

Therefore, I would conclude by saying that by abandoning the elective principle at all stages, the Government has shown disrespect to what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru wanted. This trend is reflective of a trend towards authoritarianism and, I think, every one who loves democracy should oppose it.

Lastly, all the students, karmacharis,

professors, and research scholars of the Visva-Bharati University are today highly agitated and are opposed to this Bill. I want to know how the Government propose to run the Visva-Bharati University without the help and cooperation of those who matter very much in the university administration, whether they have the idea of setting up CRP or some other organization of that nature to quell the dissatisfaction that is smouldering at the campus of Visva-Bharati.

With these words, I oppose the Bill.

श्री गिरधारी लाल ध्यास (भीलवाड़ा) : माननीय सभापति जी, विश्व भारती अमेंडमेंट बिल, 1984 जो यहाँ पर प्रस्तुत किया गया है उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। यहाँ पर हमारे सी० पी० एम० के भाइयों ने कहा है कि यह बिल जो लाया गया है वह गुरुदेव की विचारधाराओं पर आधारित नहीं है। और यूनिटी इन डाइवर्सिटी का जो प्रश्न बसु जी ने उठाया है, उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इसके जो आब्जैक्ट्स हैं सैक्शन 5 में उसमें कहा गया है :

"The objects of the University shall be to disseminate and advance knowledge and understanding by providing instructional, extension and research facilities and by the example and influence of its corporate life...."

जो आखिरी है उसमें दिया है :

"(v).....free from all antagonisms of race, nationality, creed or caste and in the name of the One Supreme Being who is *Shantam, Shivam, Advaitam*.

तो जो भी उनकी विचारधारा थी और जो आइडियाज थे उसको इन आब्जैक्ट्स में रखा गया है। ऐसी हालत में इस प्रकार का प्रश्न उठाना ; मैं समझता हूँ निश्चित तरीके से बुद्धिमत्तापूर्ण नहीं है।

दूसरी बात रेजिमेंटेशन के सम्बन्ध में कही गई है, लेकिन यह बात उस समय पैदा होती जब सारा बोर्ड सरकारी अधिकारियों का ही बना दिया

[श्री गिरधारीलाल व्यास]

जाता लेकिन इसमें तो हर प्रकार के लोगों को, क्वालिफिकेशन, डिग्री और मैरिट के आधार पर, चाहे एग्जिक्यूटिव कौंसिल हो या कोर्ट हो, उसमें उन लोगों को रखने की व्यवस्था की गई है। सभी प्रकार के लोगों को रिप्रेजेंटेशन दिया गया है। लेकिन सी० पी० एम० के भाई तो जो रेजिमेंटेशन करते हैं उसी के आधार पर बात कर रहे हैं। ये लोग सरकारी नौकरों का रेजिमेंटेशन नहीं करना चाहते, सी० पी० एम० के भाई, तो जिस प्रकार का रेजिमेंटेशन कलकत्ता यूनिवर्सिटी में किया गया है, उसी तरह का रेजिमेंटेशन यहां पर भी चाहते हैं। वे तो चाहेंगे कि वहां पर टीचर्स भी उसी विचारधारा के होने चाहिए और स्टूडेंट्स भी उसी विचारधारा में विश्वास रखने वाले होने चाहिए। यदि इस प्रकार का रेजिमेंटेशन हमारे वसु साहब करवाना चाहते हैं तो दूसरी बात है। अगर आप सारे देश के लोगों को एक साथ लेकर चलना चाहते हैं, जिस प्रकार की हमारी भावना है तो प्रश्न दूसरा है। तब तो निश्चित तरीके से इस प्रकार के लोगों को लिया जाना चाहिए। ताकि सभी लोग रिप्रजेंट कर सकें।

अब आप यह देखें कि जहां पर अध्यापकों को वोटिंग राइट दिया है, वहां पर क्या स्थिति है। कितने उनमें ग्रुप बब गए हैं। जहां कहीं भी झगड़े होते हैं, वे उन्हीं युपबाजी की वजह से होते हैं। हमारे माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री जो बिल सदन में लाए हैं, वह रेजीमेंटेशन को खत्म करने के लिए हैं ताकि यूनिवर्सिटीज का कामकाज ठीक प्रकार से चल सके। इस व्यवस्था को उल्टा विरोधी पक्ष को समर्थन देना चाहिए, लेकिन ये इसका विरोध कर रहे हैं। आप अपने दृष्टिकोण से इसका विरोध कर रहे हैं और आपको विरोध करना भी चाहिए। इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है। सरकार को ऐसी व्यवस्था निश्चित तरीके से करनी पड़ेगी जिससे शांतिपूर्वक जो लोग पढ़ना चाहते हैं, उनको पढ़ने के अवसर मिल सकें। पांच-सात परसेंट ही ऐसे लोग हैं जो दादागिरी करके झगड़ा फसाद पैदा करके सारी व्यवस्था को बिगाड़ना चाहते हैं।

लेकिन 95 फीसदी ऐसे लोग हैं, जो पढ़ना चाहते हैं। अव्यवस्था फैलाने वाले लोग इन्हीं पोलिटिकल पार्टियों से माइडेड होते हैं, जिनका इसके पीछे राजनीति स्वार्थ होता है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : बैन कर दो।

श्री गिरधारी लाल व्यास : बैन का सवाल नहीं है, सवाल यह है कि यूनिवर्सिटीयों में इस प्रकार की अव्यवस्था नहीं होनी चाहिए, ताकि वहां की व्यवस्था ठीक प्रकार से चल सके। अभी राय साहब कह रहे थे कि इसमें एग्जीक्यूटिव के संबंध में कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई है। उन्होंने कहा रूल डेवलपमेंट के संबंध में कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है, इनका काम ही केवल सरकार को किसी तरह से क्रिटिसाइज करना है। आपने देखा नहीं है कि डायरेक्टोरेट फोर रूल डेवलपमेंट के संबंध में अलग से व्यवस्था है।

सभापति महोदय, आप अभी से घंटी बजा रहे हैं, लेकिन मुझे तो अभी बहुत कुछ बोलना है। आप मुझे बोलने ही नहीं देना चाहते हैं।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Don't be unfair. Your name is not in your Party's list. Still I have given you a chance. Don't impute things to me.

श्री गिरधारी लाल व्यास : मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करते हुए अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ (Baramulla) : I felt somehow that I must support this Bill because...

AN HON. MEMBER : Why somehow ?

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : Because your intentions are not always right. ... (Interruptions)

What has prompted me to support the Bill is the objects of the University that have been explained—the four objects. These objects are very laudable and I will mention only the first one because all people have studied these objects. To study the mind of

man in its realisation of different aspects of truth from diverse points of view. There are other laudable things and laudable goals. I respect these objects before the Ministry of Education. And the fifth one is that they want to have a cultural synthesis and there will be provision for the study of diverse civilisations which is a very laudable goal that they have set before them...

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : This is not done by them. These are the objects which were given by Tagore himself. We are not debating that.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : So far as *Visva-Bharati* is concerned, that is the highest seat where you can learn lessons of cultural synthesis.

If you are to learn, in fact, the culture of India, learn it from the seat of *Visva-Bharati*. I salute that institution and I salute the sweet memory of its founder. Since they have put forth the objectives, I must salute the objectives also and give them credit for what they have put in.

16.56 hrs.

(MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Soz, I have come to the Chair. You can address me.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : I am addressing all the people through you.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Because you were addressing Prof. Chakraborty, I have to tell you that.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : So far the objectives are concerned, they are very laudable.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Jaipur) : You need not inform the House. Your presence is automatically felt.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Because he was addressing Prof. Chakraborty, I have to tell him to address me.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : They want-

ed to do many things. So far as objectives are concerned, for instance, they want to bring into more intimate relations with one another, through patient study and research, the different cultures of the East on the basis of their underlying unity. They talk about unity of mind ; they talk about culture and they talk about the study of diverse cultures. These are very laudable goals. I have given my support to the Bill and I am going to do it. All these objectives are laudable. But, I must remind them. It is one thing to talk and rise to present the bill and it is another thing to tell what they have put forth. Sir, at Tirupati their leaders addressed the teenagers, the youth of India—two thousand of them—and they wanted them to become militant. They equated the situation in Punjab with Jammu and Kashmir. This is how they are poisoning the minds of the people. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER (Delhi Sadar) : Why not ? I want to put the record straight. Of course we say that wherever there are extremists, they have to be dealt with sternly. There may be some extremists in their State.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : Sir, they want to poison the minds of these people because they are in power. Then how can you live up to these ideals—I do not know. You cannot live up to them.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Come to the subject proper. This is a very important Bill, Mr. Soz.

SHRI BAPUSAHEB PARULEKAR (Ratnagiri) : You were not here when other speakers spoke. He was probably replying to them.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : I am telling them only one or two things. I was not to go clause by clause. I am only asking them that they should be conscious of their duties to the nation. They have put forth these laudable goals before them. But, so far as the practice is concerned, they are doing contrary to what they have put forth in the Bill. What are the goals before them ? Do they have respect for democratic institutions ? I will tell you one or two things. They talk about truth. But they have lost

[Prof. Saifuddin Soz]

the respect for the truth. They have lost respect for everything and still they talk of the laudable goals and, therefore, I want to draw the attention of the House to that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Soz, you are an experienced orator.

AN HON. MEMBER : Is he supporting ?

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : I am supporting the Bill. I am also reminding them of their responsibility and requesting them to keep that in view and work further afterwards. I shall point out two things to you. I feel that you must accept my amendments if you are prepared for that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Have you given any amendments ?

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : They must take note of these. It happens in this House that whenever a Bill is put forth, it is to be passed. They have scant respect for the views expressed by the Opposition. They do not care.

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER : The Opposition is always welcome to give their views.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Prof. Soz is a very knowledgeable person whose views will always be taken into consideration.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Is he coming from Tirupathi ?

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER : They have to keep somebody to control you in all these things.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : The Chancellor is the head of the University. He shall be appointed by the Visitor from out of a panel of persons recommended by the Executive Council under the provisions of the Act. The Chancellor should have proper qualifications. This has not been provided for in the Bill. Without proper qualifications he cannot become a Chancellor. This is kept vague in the Bill. The Chancellor

should be an eminent educationist. But no such provision is made in the Bill. I want to know whether the Visitor is going to appoint the Chancellor according to his whims and fancies. I want to ask the Education Minister, what is the formula for appointment of the Chancellor. In any university the Chancellor has got wide executive powers. The executive council has its own powers ; but the Chancellor derives power directly from the Act and discharges the executive functions. Therefore they must be very cautious in selecting the Chancellor for Visva Bharati University and they cannot decide things by whims and fancies. The qualification of the Chancellor should have been indicated in the Bill, which they have not done. He should be a prominent educationist ; who has got taste for India's culture and arts. I don't see anything on that in the Bill which has been presented.

Now I come to the subject of nomination. They don't want any democratic institution to flourish in this country. One institution about which I feel very much concerned is the Students' Council. The students are at an impressionable age ; it all depends upon how you train them ; if you train them in democracy they become democrats ; if you train them in autocratic way, they become autocrats ; if you train them in authoritarian manner, they become autocrats in life. They say that Students' Council will be formed on the basis of merit. Whatever is provided in this regard is absolutely vague. You say, students who have got prizes in their field. What kind of prize ? Any kind of prize can be given by any high school headmaster. What is the type of prize that you want to be considered ? There are prizes of all kinds. You say, selection will be on the basis of extracurricular activity and all round development of personality. But who will determine all these things ? So, this is kept absolutely vague. This term namely 'extra-curricular activity' and 'all round development of personality' should be properly defined in the Bill. This is what I would suggest to the hon. Minister. How can he become all round personality ? Which will be the institution which will give him the certificate ? These things have to be looked into by the hon. Minister.

In respect of Students Council as the Bill

says, it will be on the principle of nomination. It should be 50 per cent by nomination on the basis of merit. How this is to be done is not provided for. And 50 per cent should be on the basis of selection. They have to put it clearly and remove the vagueness.

It is in the schools that the elections should take place. Otherwise we can never have democracy in the Lok Sabha or in the Rajya Sabha. Unless we have such a system in the schools, we cannot have democratic system in the country's administration.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : All of you must go there and join the campaign.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : Sir, very often it happens that you may have brilliant students, they may have brilliant mind, but they may not become a book-worm and get first-class or first in the University examinations. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was not first in the University examination. But he was one of the 11 persons who had tremendous command over English language in Asia. I read it some 25 years ago in some journal. He was one of the meritorious students and he had such a tremendous command over the language. But he was never a first-class student throughout his student career. So, in order to find out the persons who are really brilliant, the yardstick should not be by way of first position or first-class Degree holders, but there are other qualities and those qualities are reflected and given expression to through proper election and therefore I would plead with you that you should provide that in the Bill that at least 50% of the students must come not by nomination but by direct election.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRIES OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL) : Sir, I have listened with rapt attention to the speeches of the hon. Members of the House. The mere fact that about 17 of them have participated in the debate shows the immense interest they have taken in this Bill. Prof. Chakraborty has given us some ideas and he has pointed out that people could develop in freedom, deve-

lop creativity and culture and I agree with him and that is why precisely for this reason and to emphasise on this point, the spirit of freedom and creativity, that the Bill has proposed a special Post of a Director of Culture and also another Director will look after the educational innovations. I have felt during the discussion that some of the hon. Members perhaps did not go through the Bill properly. Had they done it, perhaps they would have had full satisfaction. Prof. Chakraborty also said that so much power has been given to the Vice-Chancellor. Now, the effective power of the Visitor is to annul proceedings which are not in conformity with the provisions of the Act as Statutes. This power is necessarily in the nature of an Appellate power and cannot be invoked unless there is a *prima facie* case of violations of the statutory provisions. Then, Prof. Chakraborty also suggested that the Bill might be returned. But to return a Bill—which has been discussed and debated in both the Houses for four years—is not fair and I do not think it will be fair on our part to do so because the people with intelligence who have been Members of the Committee and who have given their suggestions, have spent so much time and energy to bring forward this Bill in this House. I do not think that that would be feasible. Prof. Ranga also gave an account of his own experience. Prof. Ranga pointed out that during Gurudev's time, there were no elections. He has rightly pointed out that the governance of the University should be made free from those procedures which incite conflict. He has also rightly pleaded for appropriate action to liberate our universities from narrow regionalism, casteism and his suggestion to have VCs from outside the region or State also seems very timely. Prof. Ranga has also said that it is recognised by many educationalists that election principle in universities has encouraged conflicts and has contributed greatly to the drift in the universities. It has, therefore, been rightly pointed out that universities should concentrate on research, training and educational innovations rather than on electioneering. The Joint Committee have eliminated the election principle keeping all these factors in view and we have accepted the recommendations of the Joint Committee because of this.

Shri Bhagawan Dev also gave some sug-

[Shrimati Sheila Kaul]

gestions which we had appreciated and he also supported our Bill.

Prof. Ajit Kumar Mehta has asked whether the Joint Committee has given thought to Gurudev's idea of harmony of man with nature and whether any provision has been made in the Bill to promote the harmony. Now, I draw the attention of the hon. member to Page 46 of the Bill where a provision has been made for an Advisory Council and a specific duty has been laid upon it to make suggestions on this idea, i.e. to create an atmosphere and environment at Visva-Bharati so as to provide a natural stimulus to the students and teachers to see the values of truth, goodness, beauty and harmony with nature.

Then Prof. Mehta also stated that the University has no provision for research and studies on science and technology. If he has gone through the Bill, he would not have said the same. He would have found that there is a Bhavan for study of science, viz. Siksha Bhavan in Shanti Niketan. There is Palli Siksha Bhavan, that is Agricultural Bhavan and there is Palli Sangathan Vibhag or Department for rural re-construction. We should also remember that Rabindranath Tagore wrote a book called "Vishva Parichay" which provides the basis for study of science.

Shri Ram Kinkar also supported this Bill.

उन्होंने कहा कि हमें उनकी पेन्टिंग्स पर खास तौर पर ध्यान देना चाहिए था। मैं उनको बताना चाहती हूँ कि उनकी पेन्टिंग्स की नुमाइशों न केवल हिन्दुस्तान में ही आयोजित की गई हैं, बल्कि कई बाहर के यूरोपियन मुल्कों में भी गुरुदेव की पेन्टिंग्स की नुमाइशें हुई हैं और हो रही हैं। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि वहाँ होस्टल का इंतजाम हो तो बेहतर होगा। हमने इस काम के लिए 50.20 लाख रुपये का प्रबन्ध किया है ताकि विश्व-भारती में होस्टल का निर्माण किया जा सके। इसके अतिरिक्त विश्व-भारती को लगभग 1.67 करोड़ रुपया इसी ख्याल से दिया गया है

ताकि उसकी तरक्की हो सके। यहाँ पर राय साहब ने कहा कि गुरुदेव श्रीनिकेतन को बहुत ज्यादा अहमियत देते थे, हमने उसको बिल्कुल नैग्लेक्ट कर दिया है। लेकिन उनकी यह बात तथ्यों पर आधारित नहीं है, सही नहीं है। क्योंकि जो—

The post of Director of Studies on Technological Innovations and Rural Re-construction has been created precisely to bring about the development in Shri Niketan and integration of Shri Niketan with Shanti Niketan.

और बहुत सारे मॅम्बर्स ने जिक्र किया है, मैं सबको आभारी हूँ जिन्होंने अपनी राय दी है और सबने यही कहा कि यह बिल अच्छा है, जैसा कि दूसरे सदन में भी इसको पसन्द किया गया था। हमें अफसोस है कि इसके आगे में देर हो गई, उसकी वजह आपको भी पता है क्योंकि यह पहले का बिल था, बीच में तब्दीली हो गई थी। फिर जब यह सरकार आ गई तो हम इस बिल को लाए हैं और यह मैं बताना चाहती हूँ कि :

The Joint Committee has recommended that the system of election for representation on decision-making bodies of the University should be replaced by a system of rotation by seniority.

अब चूँकि जॉइंट कमेटी ने यह बात कही है हम उसके खिलाफ नहीं जा सकते।

The Committee made this observation after a great deal of deliberation. According to the Committee, the concept of a University as a centre of study, research and reflection in which teachers and students are partners, should promote corporate and harmonious living. A system of election generally involves conflicts which are not conducive to peaceful academic atmosphere, and since the Joint Committee has come to the conclusion that the system of elections should be replaced, it is only fair that their recommendation should be given a trial.

Since the Act also envisages the establishment of instruments which provide opportunities to all sections of the University com-

munity to express their views in their spheres, any fear or apprehension that various sections of the universities will have no opportunity to participate in the affairs of the University is misplaced.

I did note the concern expressed by several Members regarding the need for action being taken by the Central Government for implementation of concurrency provision in the Constitution in regard to education. Members have also pointed out that there is a wide variety of patterns in the matter of traditional components of the University set-up. Some Members have referred to the differences in the procedures in regard to appointment, powers and functions of various officers like Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor. Some Members have also referred to the chaotic conditions prevailing in the matter of composition, powers and functions of various statutory bodies like Syndicate, Senate etc. Concern has also been expressed in regard to actions being taken by several State Governments which have the effect of undermining the norms and traditions of the University, as we know it.

I am in entire agreement with the Members that this is a very undesirable state of affairs, and that something needs to be done very urgently. So far as concurrency is concerned, I would like to point out that the Congress Government had made education a Concurrent subject since January, 1977. I would like to reiterate that we are fully committed to the implementation of the constitutional provision of concurrency in educational field and, in particular, in the field of higher education, with which we are immediately concerned. I would like to assure the hon. Members that in response to their demands, we would be bringing forward a comprehensive legislation in the field of higher education, especially in the matter of governance. While the details and the modalities of the Bill would be worked out, so far as I can see, the Bill will take account of recommendations made by the Gajendragadkar Committee on the governance of Universities in 1971, and subsequent developments. One of the objectives of the Bill would be to bring about some uniformity, as was suggested 'by

the hon. Members, in the matter of appointment, powers and functions of certain key officers of the Universities, namely Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellor etc.

The age-old structures in Universities have become too rigid to permit any worthwhile innovations and reforms in higher education. Curricular reforms to incorporate physical education and sports, culture, national service, extension activities etc. are vital to make higher education a process for the development of creativity and integrated personality of students. It would be necessary to create appropriate instruments within the Universities to bring about these reforms.

This is a matter of the greatest interest to all concerned. I would reiterate the earnestness of Government's intention to bring forward a comprehensive legislation with a view to bring about desirable uniformity in the structures of governance of universities and in the patterns of organisation through which the highest academic interests can be served.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Visva-Bharati Act, 1951, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House will now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There are no amendments to Clauses 2 to 8. I put them together to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That Clauses 2 to 8 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 8 were added to the Bill.

Clauses 9—Substitution of new section for section 14.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY
(Katwa) : I beg to move :

Page 9,—

for lines 3 to 6, *substitute*—

“14. (1) The Court shall elect by simple majority one person from among a panel of three persons to be elected similarly by the Executive Council, for the post of the Vice-Chancellor and the Paridarsaka (Visitor) shall appoint the Vice-Chancellor.”
(1)

I want that the appointment and the selection of Vice-Chancellor is to be done by the Court, the highest body of the University ; and there should not be the procedure as that is written there that a Committee be nominated and they will make a panel of 3 persons ; and that will be referred to the Paridarsaka and he will from those 3 persons appoint him. It is unnecessary and undemocratic. The power should be with the Court to elect one person out of a panel that will be made by the Executive Council Secretariat of the Court and that will be final. No question of referring it to any other person ; they should have the fullest autonomy. This is what I am asking on the basis of what has happened in the Calcutta University. The Senate elected a panel of three persons through proportional representation and sent it. It was written in the Law that with the consultation of the Education Minister of the State, the Chancellor, that is Rajpal, the Governor, will appoint him ; and what the Governor did was that he used his unwarranted discretionary power ;—he did not respect the advise of the government of West Bengal—what he is bound to do, and he ignored the advise of the majority of Senate members who wrote to the Chancellor. He violated everything and appointed his own person of his liking ; that is totally disgraceful and is motivated.

Consequent upon this, another amendment to that law has been made that the Senate will finally decide and no question of the Minister or of the Chancellor comes into the picture. The Senate will finally select

one person.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRIES OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL) : The main purpose of the mover is, I think, that the Court and the Executive Council shall be associated with the selection of the Vice-Chancellor. But this has already been taken care of by the provisions of the Bill. But the main difference is that whereas the mover wants to introduce a process of election without any scope or choice to the Visitor, our proposal envisages a procedure of a selection committee. We feel in the process of election, extraneous considerations will prevail. The selection committee will consider the matter in a calm and dispassionate manner. There would be a further screening when the Visitor would have an opportunity of selecting the best person. Moreover the procedure suggested by us is more or less in consonance with the procedure which is followed for selection of Vice-Chancellors in other Central Universities. The procedure in the Bill appears to be more rational and has several advantages. I oppose the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I put amendment no. 1 to Clause 9 moved by Shri Saifuddin Choudhury to the vote of the House.

The amendment was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There are no amendments to clauses 10 to 26. I put them together to the vote of the House. The question is :

“That Clauses 9 to 26 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 9 to 26 were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now Clause 27. Mr. Saifuddin Choudhury.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY
(Katwa) : I beg to move :

Pages 29 and 30,—

for lines 32 to 40 and 1 to 11, respectively, *substitute*—

"Representatives of Adhyapakas

- (xii) one *adhyapaka* from the *adhyapakas* of all the Institutes by means of election through simple majority system ;

Representatives of non-teaching staff

- (xiii) five representatives of non-teaching staff to be elected ;

Representatives of Students

- (xiv) two students to be elected by the students of the University" (2)

Page 32,—

for lines 15 to 30, *substitute*—

- "(vi) three *Adhyakshas* from among the *Adyakshas* of *Palli-Sangathana Vibhaga, Palli-Siksha Sadan, Kala-Bhavana, Sangeet Bhavana, Vidya-Bhavana, and Stksha-Bhavana* to be elected ;

- (vii) three *adhyapakas* of the University to be elected by themselves.

- (viii) the non-teaching employees to be elected by themselves ;

- (ix) three students to be elected by themselves ;" (3)

Pages 34 and 35,—

for lines 37 to 45 and 1 to 8, respectively, *substitute*—

- "(x) seven *adhyapakas* of the University to be elected from among themselves ;

- (xi) five students to be elected by themselves ;" (4)

Page 36,—

for, lines 32 to 36, *substitute*—

- "(ii) one *Adhyapakas* to be elected by the *adhyaksha* members of the *Karma Samiti* (Executive Council) ;

- (iii) two persons to be elected by the *Karma Simiti* (Executive Council) from among its members of whom one shall be an employee of the University ;" (5)

Pages 47 and 48,—

for lines 22 to 45 and 1 and 2, respectively, *substitute*—

- "(1) Students' Council shall be constituted by the students of the University by means of election by simple majority system.

- (2) The functions of the Students' Council shall be to promote fraternity and sense of organisation and social service among the students and prepare them to be the good citizens of the country through the exercise of democratic procedures and the students' Council shall strive to ameliorate the grievances of the students and shall foster cordial relation with the teachers and employees of the University and shall also organise cultural and sport activities regularly." (6)

Now, in this Bill in the Objectives and Aims many good things are mentioned and on that account many Members have supported this Bill. I have no objection to that. Those who have supported the Bill, if they are given an opportunity to write, can also suggest good things. It is not something invented by the Ministry. Tagore himself did it. Our concern is the modalities that are going to destroy the ideals of Tagore. In the constitution of the Samsad the procedure of election has been done away with. That is going to be done by selection. Everybody will be nominated. *Adhyapakas* will be nominated ; the non-teaching staff will be nominated. I have no objection if the nominations are made to the Congress(1) party officials. But intellectuals and university professors could not be nominated. We believe in their power. We do not think that merit or seniority is opposed by democracy. On the other hand democracy embraces all these and other qualities. Where democracy is there, merit

[Shri Saifuddin Choudhury]

cannot be suppressed. Here something is said like this ; that the democratic functioning is hampering the growth of merit. It is totally false. We have our experiences. During those days, in West Bengal, when Cong. (I) was in power and a reign of terror and autocracy was established, what did we see ? We saw that there was no democracy. No student union was elected. Where was the merit in those days ? Merit was in the pockets of Congress (I) leaders, and hoodlums. They use to put it for sale. Question papers were leaked. Mass copying took place. It is only when students, teachers and employees got back their democratic rights that all of us, with our rights, fought that.

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VASANT SATHE) : Same as it is now in West Bengal !

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : What ? In Delhi University what do you see ? In Central Board Examination, what is going on ?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South) : What is going on ? I will just narrate a Bengali saying :

“Chiradin Andhakare Basoti Jahar
Alok Tahar Pakshya Lajjar Karon”

Which, when translated into English means, “A man who lives in perpetual darkness is ashamed of light !”
(Interruptions)

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar) : I can also say another Bengali saying :

“Loke jara boro bale Sai boro hay
Apanare Boro bale Sai bora nay”

Which means, “People become big if they are stated to be big, not that they are big.”

SHRI VASANT SATHE : This is darkness replied to by light.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : We stand for preserving seniority and merit.

And democracy stands for all that. Seniority cannot be the only criterion. A senior can be crippled, other senior can be reluctant, what is the way out ? The issue involved here is of principle that is a teacher is nominated by Government. I am very unhappy that the Joint Committee did not consider it. It is a very serious matter. Now nomination should be done away with.

Now for Students Association if elections for the posts are not there, then more deterioration in the behaviour of the students will take place which will lead to mass copying and all sorts of corruption and nepotism and conspiracies, without democratic participation which will go unchecked.

Now, the point is that in order to make the students organised, conscious, dutiful and civilised, we demand that this right of election should be there and you cannot take it out.

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL : It does not give representation to all the Institutes of Visva-Bharati so far as teachers are concerned. Our procedure in regard to non-teaching staff makes no distinction of hierarchy among the non-teaching staff. To this extent, the procedure envisaged by us is more egalitarian and the procedure of the Mover is contrary to it. We have proposed that two students should be nominated by Shiksha Samiti from amongst students who have distinguished themselves in various fields like studies and other extra-curricular activities. The proposal of the Mover viz. simple election ignores this vital aspect. So, I oppose this amendment.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now I shall put amendment No. 2 to the vote of the House.

The question is :

Pages 29 and 30,—

for lines 32 to 40 and 1 to 11,
respectively, substitute—

“Representatives of Adhyapakas

(xii) one adhyapaka from the adhyapakas of all the Institutes by means of election through simple majority system ;

Representatives of non-teaching staff

(xiii) five representatives of non-teaching staff to be elected;

Representatives of Students

(xiv) two students to be elected by the students of the University" (2)

The Lok Sabha—divided

Division No. 2

17.39 hrs.

AYES

Acharia, Shri Basudeb.
Barman, Shri Palas
Bhattacharyya, Shri Sushil
Chakraborty, Shri Satyasadhan
Chatterjee, Shri Somnath
Choubey, Shri Narayan
Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin
Giri, Shri Sudhir
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
Imbichibava, Shri E.K.
Jha, Shri Bhogendra
Khan, Shri Ghulam Mohammad
Kodiyan, Shri P.K.
Mahata, Shri Chitta
Maitra, Shri Sunil
Mandal, Shri Dhanik Lal
Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar
Masudal Hossain, Shri Syed
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
Mukherjee, Shri Samar
Pal, Prof. Rup Chand
Pathak, Shri Ananda

Rai, Shri M. Ramanna
Roy Shri A.K.
Roy, Dr. Saradish
Roypradhan, Shri Amar
Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
Saha, Shri Gadadhar
Sen, Shri Subodh
Shamanna, Shri T.R.
Zainal Abedin, Shri

NOES

Ansari, Shri Z.R.
Bagun Sumbui, Shri
Bansi Lal, Shri
Bhagwan Dev, Acharya
Bhole, Shri R.R.
Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh
Birbal, Shri
Buta Singh, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri Manphool Singh
Chaudhuri, Shri A.B.A. Ghani Khan
Choudhari, Shrimati Usha Prakash
Dabhi, Shri Ajitsinh
Daga, Shri Mool Chand
Dennis, Shri N.
Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
Dogra, Shri G.L.
Ghorpade, Shri R.Y.
Gomango, Shri Giridhar
Jain, Shri Bhiku Ram
Jena, Shri Chintamani
Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
Kaushal, Shri Jagan Nath
Ken, Shri Lala Ram
Khan, Shri Arif Mohammad
Kidwai, Shrimati Mohsina
Kuchan, Shri Gangadhar S.
Lakkappa, Shri K.
Mahajan, Shri Y.S.
Mallanna, Shri K.

Mallick, Shri Lakshman
 Mallikarjun, Shri
 Mishra, Shri Ram Nagina
 Misra, Shri Nityananda
 Mohanty, Shri Brajamohan
 Murthy, Shri M.V. Chandrashekhara
 Nair, Shri B.K.
 Namgyal, Shri P.
 Patel, Shri Shantubhai
 Patil, Shri A.T.
 Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athare
 Pattabhi Rama Rao, Shri S.B.P.
 Phulwariya, Shri Virda Ram
 Poojary, Shri Janardhana
 Prasan Kumar, Shri S.N.
 Rane, Shrimati Sanyogita
 Ranga, Prof. N.G.
 Rao, Shri M. Nageswara
 Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
 Rao, Shri P.V. Narasimha
 Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara
 Roat, Shri Jai Narain
 Sathe, Shri Vasant
 Sawant, Shri T.M.
 Sebastian, Shri S.A. Dorai
 Sethi, Shri Arjun
 Sethi, Shri P.C.
 Shailani, Shri Chandra Pal
 Sharma, Shri Kali Charan
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Shiv Shankar, Shri P.
 Sidnal, Shri S.B.
 Soren, Shri Hari Har
 Suryawanshi, Shri Narsing
 Thorat, Shri Bhausahab
 Thungon, Shri P.K.

Tytlar, Shri Jagdish
 Varma, Shri Jai Ram
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Verma, Shri Deen Bandhu
 Vijayaraghavan, Shri V.S.
 Vyas, Shri Girdhari Lal
 Wasnik, Shri Balkrishna
 Yadav, Shri R.N.
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Subject to correction, the result* of the Division is : Ayes 31, Noes 75.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now I shall put amendments No. 3, 4 and 5 to Clause 27 to the vote of the House.

The amendments Nos. 3, 4 and 5 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now I shall put amendment No. 6.

The question is :

Pages 47 and 48,—

for lines 22 to 45 and 1 and 2, respectively, substitute—

- “(1) Students' Council shall be constituted by the students of the University by means of election by simple majority system.
- (2) The functions of the Students' Council shall be to promote fraternity and sense of organisation and social service among the students and prepare them to be the good citizens of the country through the exercise of democratic procedures and the Students' Council shall strive to ameliorate the grievances of the students and shall foster cordial relation with the teachers and employees of the University and shall

*The following Members also recorded their votes :—

AYES : Shri Hannan Mollah

NOES : S/Shri Madhusudan Vairale and Bishnu Prasad.

also organise cultural and sport
activities regularly." (6)

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 3

17.42 hrs.

AYES

Acharia, Shri Basudeb
Barman, Shri Palas
Bhattacharyya, Shri Sushil
Chakraborty, Shri Satyasadhan
Chatterjee, Shri Somnath
Choubey, Shri Narayan
Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin
Giri, Shri Sudhir
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
Hannan Mollah, Shri
Imbichibava, Shri E.K.
Jha, Shri Bhogendra
Khan, Shri Ghulam Mohammad
Kodiyani, Shri P.K.
Mahata, Shri Chitta
Maitra, Shri Sunil
Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar
Masudal Hossain, Shri Syed
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
Muherjee, Shri Samar
Pal, Prof. Rup Chand
Pathak, Shri Ananda
Rai, Shri M. Ramanna
*Ranga, Prof. N.G.
Roy, Shri A.K.
Roypradhan, Shri Amar
Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
Saha, Shri Gadadhar
Sen, Shri Subodh
Zainal Abedin, Shri

NOES

Ansari, Shri Z.R.
Bagun Sumbrui, Shri
Bansi Lal, Shri
Bhagwan Dev, Acharya
Bhole, Shri R.R.
Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh
Birbal, Shri
Bishnu Prasad, Shri
Buta Singh, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri Manphool Singh
Chaudhuri, Shri A.B.A. Ghani Khan
Choudhari, Shrimati Usha Prakash
Dabhi, Shri Ajitsinh
Daga, Shri Mool Chand
Dennis, Shri N.
Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
Dogra, Shri G.L.
Ghorpade, Shri R.Y.
Gomango, Shri Giridhar
Jain, Shri Bhiku Ram
Jena, Shri Chintamani
Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
Kaushal, Shri Jagan Nath
Ken, Shri Lala Ram
Khan, Shri Arif Mohammad
Kidwai, Shrimati Mohsina
Kuchan, Shri Gangadhar S.
Lakkappa, Shri K.
Mahajan, Shri Y.S.
Mallanna, Shri K.
Mallick, Shri Lakshman
Mallikarjun, Shri
Mishra, Shri Ram Nagina
Misra, Shri Nityananda
Mohanty, Shri Brajamohan
Murthy, Shri M.V. Chandrashekhara
Naikar, Shri D.K.

Nair, Shri B.K.
 Namgyal, Shri P.
 Patel, Shri Shantubhai
 Patil, Shri A.T.
 Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athara
 Pattabhi Rama Rao, Shri S.B.P.
 Phulwariya, Shri Virda Ram
 Poojary, Shri Janardhana
 Prasan Kumar, Shri S.N.
 Rane, Shrimati Sanyogita
 Rao, Shri M. Nageswara
 Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
 Rao, Shri P.V. Narasimha
 Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara
 Roat, Shri Jai Narain
 Sathe, Shri Vasant
 Sawant, Shri T.M.
 Sebastian, Shri S.A. Dorai
 Sethi, Shri Arjun
 Sethi, Shri P.C.
 Shailani, Shri Chandra Pal
 Sharma, Shri Kali Charan
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore
 Shiv Shankar, Shri P.
 Sidnal, Shri S.B.
 Soren, Shri Harihar
 Suryawanshi, Shri Narsingrao
 Thorat, Shri Bhausahab
 Thungon, Shri P.K.
 Tytler, Shri Jagdish
 Vairale, Shri Madhusudan
 Varma, Shri Jai Ram
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Verma, Shri Deen Bandhu

Vijayaraghavan, Shri V.S.
 Vyas, Shri Girdhari Lal
 Wasnik, Shri Balkrishna
 Yadav, Shri R.N.
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Subject to correction the result* of the Division is :

Ayes 30 : Noes 77.

The Motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There are no amendments in Clause 28 to 30. Therefore, I put Clause 27, 28 to 30 to the vote of the House together.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That Clause 27 to 30 stand part of the Bill."

The Motion was adopted.

Clause 27 to 30 were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"The Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The Motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRIES OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL) : I beg to move :

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The Motion was adopted.

*The following members also recorded their votes :

AYES : Dr. Saradish Roy.

NOES : Prof. N.G. Ranga.