

I can assure the House that we are alive to all these things, and that our scientists are actively engaged in making the best use of nuclear science in all its aspects for peaceful purposes. I stress peaceful purposes because my position has been made somewhat difficult by the intervention of Shri Bibhuti Mishra who had referred to certain views of mine in the past.

Shri Ramavatar Shastri had asked about a five-year plan. There is a five year plan for everything but that is not enough; we have a ten-year plan for this. In fact, there is a ten-year profile which I think he may have seen if he were interested in this subject, which spells out in detail what the plans are and have been, and in fact, we are now engaged in reviewing the progress made under the ten-year profile and how far we have succeeded in achieving the targets which have been set out in the plan.

My hon. friend Shri D. K. Panda had asked about marine propulsion. That is again one of the subjects which we are studying and which is under study, but again it is a subject on which I would request him not to make me say anything more.

I would like to end only by referring to one other point which does need a comment on my part, and that is in regard to the point made by Shri Bibhuti Mishra that Government are not letting the scientists have their way or they are not allowing the scientists to have their head or they are somehow suppressing them and not allowing them to progress. That is absolutely not correct. Government and the very brilliant set of scientists who are working in this field have in the past years constructed a structure in the field of nuclear science of which we can well be proud, and which is one of the finest of its kind in any developing country, and I would say one of the good scientific communities and structure in the world in the nuclear field. We

have to congratulate them, and we have to thank them, and I can assure my hon. friends that they and the Government work together; they are a part of the Government. We certainly do not restrict them in any sense, any sense of the term. Our policy is to use nuclear science for peaceful purposes and within that overall policy, whatever facilities they require, if they require additional allocation of funds, etc., in all these things the Government takes as liberal a view as it can consistent with the resources of the economy and we are all very much mindful of the fact that the good start which the country has made in the nuclear field, one of the modern fields of science should be kept up and should progress and we should try to keep in the forefront of this science which has great potentialities for the future.

18.16 hrs.

DISCUSSION ON STUDENT UNREST IN THE COUNTRY AND INCIDENTS IN DELHI UNIVERSITY ON DECEMBER 6, 1972—Contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up further discussion on the increasing student unrest in the country, items 16 and 17 in the Order Paper today. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu may continue his speech.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): In the front page of the Hindustan Times there is a photo which shows what deal the present students are getting from this Government. In this photo you can see a student lying on the ground, being beaten by eight constables and a magistrate is trying to stop it. This is the deal he is getting today. You get the news headline, one inch, on the front page: many hurt in police student clashes; Delhi university had been made a battle ground.

The trouble today is that they never try to go deep into the matter and this Government unfortunately lacks an analytical mind. Students have a

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu.]

bleak future, no employment and the economic crisis that surrounds us today, surrounds them also. What is the root cause, the basic cause? In a useful editorial the *National Herald* has in its issue dated 25 September, 1972 commented as follows:

"Neither the universities nor the state administration have any readymade machinery to tackle student problems as they arise. Even legitimate demands—for drinking water provision and rest rooms for boys and girls, for example—are taken note of only after avoidable violence has occurred. In most of these cases, even if outsiders can be blamed for fomenting trouble or fanning the flames, the root of the malady is the incompetence of university or college authorities concerned, as also the tensions arising from conspiracies against one another by groups of teachers.....

And there are cases as in Kanpur, of college authorities getting high-handed and provoking students....

What is happening all over this state, as also in some others, is the strongest possible indictment of the whole educational system which has become completely unrelated to needs and offers nothing to hold the interest and attention of youth uncertain about the future,....

With each passing year the demand for more purposeful education for an ever larger number of boys and girls has made itself felt, yet there has been little serious effort to take a long-range view of the problem and reorganise the whole set-up."

There is no area in the country which is unaffected: Punjab, to start with, Haryana, U.P., Bihar, West Bengal, where Kalyani University is closed, Andhra, Rajasthan—in short no part of the country is unaffected and the Government is trying to look at the problems through the looking

glass of the police, posing it as a law and order situation. The Education Commission in its Report says that in their opinion no reform is more important than this and it adds:

"Judged from this point of view, it becomes evident that the present system of education, designed to meet the needs of an imperial administration within the limitations set by a feudal and traditional society, will need radical changes if it is to meet the purposes of a modernizing democratic and socialistic society—changes in objectives, in content, in teaching methods, in programmes, in the size and composition of the student body, in the selection and professional preparation of teachers, and in organization. In fact, what is needed is a revolution in education which in turn will set in motion the much desired social economic and cultural revolution."

It has been admitted in the Home Ministry Consultative Committee meeting held on December 12, 1972 that the Ministry have carried out an analysis, and it was circulated to Committee members.

The Home Ministry note states:

"According to analysis of the incidents in the current academic session, it was found that nearly a third of the instances of students unrest were related to demands for better academic facilities like posting of adequate qualified staff, admission of students in particular courses, take-over of mismanaged institutions by Government, better transport, etc. Another third of the incidents were attributable to issues like claims of failed students, college union elections, protests against dismissed staff, etc. The rest are instances of students taking up larger issues ranging from the domestic economic problems...."

Also the reasons are very clearly stated in a news item:

"Students cannot primarily be blamed for their violent behaviour on the university campus. The responsibility, if fixed, falls on teachers, university administrators, parents and the present structure of society, according to Dr. A. B. Ojha, a professor of psychology.

Dr. Ojha who is a scientific officer of the Directorate of Psychological Research, Ministry of Defence, says the student community as such may be contributing little to the rebel malady.

Unable to meet the demands which different social agencies make on them and when stirred on this account, onlookers label them as indiscipline. Things they do on the spur of the moment are mainly to take revenge from the society which has given them a tremendous load they are unable to cope with, he feels.

Dr. Ojha . . . asserts that free and frank comments on past and present issues by the student community shows that they are as conscientious as their guardians, teachers and others who take solace in blaming them for the evil taking place on the campus."

This is what one should understand. It has been stated in the Report of the Education Commission:

"Education should be an instrument in the hands of the nation to transform society to socialism. Education in private institutions is not only used against the declared policies of the nation—socialism, secularism, and democracy—but also propagate outdated sectarian attitudes which breed communalism, casteism, superstitions and obscurantism. Educational institutions and hostels are run for the benefit of particular caste or religious groups in many places."

The insecurity of teachers is another reason. They are recruited in

July and dismissed in March and Government indirectly supports it. The college and university teachers' strike in Haryana is a glaring example. When teachers lose interest in education, standards go down. In Haryana 1,000 professors were arrested and put as C class prisoners. A lady professor was murdered the other day. The students' union is banned there. I again quote from the Education Commission's report:

"Student unions represent an important way of providing student participation in university life outside the classroom. Properly organised, they help in self-government and self-discipline, provide a healthy outlet for students' energies and give the students useful training in the use of democratic methods."

Sir, you have fought for democratic movement all your life. You would be surprised to know that the student unions are banned in Haryana. Are we living in a democratic country?

The college teachers in Haryana have given a note and I am quoting from that:

"1. In Haryana private colleges are given affiliation by the university simply on political grounds which has resulted in the growth of large number of colleges which cannot provide minimum facilities to the students and leaders.

2. The set up of the University and the College Managing Committee is totally dominated by the vested interests. Teachers and particularly students lack representation on college managing committee. (Teachers representation on the university administrative bodies and the college managements is insignificant.) Thus the voice of the teachers and the students remain unheeded which result in occasional strikes in the private colleges.

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

3. Lack of funds with the managing committee is another factor which has led to leaders and students trouble.

4. Since the managing committee lack funds, they cannot provide minimum facilities such as library facilities, drinking water, playground, indoor and outdoor games, educational tours etc. to students which is very essential for raising the academic standards.

5. Students union is banned in Haryana which means they cannot raise their voice against the authorities despite the fact that they pay more fee than the students studying in government colleges.

Another important factor which leads to students' dissatisfaction is the quick dismissal of the lecturers on false pretexts. Teachers are recruited generally in the month of July and dismissed on 31st March next year.

Grants by the Government of Haryana to private colleges are also given on political grounds. Some managing committees are financially sound and some are badly in need of funds and when grant is given on political grounds the poor managements remain Bankrupt and therefore cannot disburse salaries to their employees for months together and sometimes they are paid in instalments and even then they are asked to sign for the full amount...."

Coming to Delhi School government aided teachers, there has to be point to point salary increase. It is a legacy of the colonialism.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): Sir, I would like a clarification. Are we discussing student unrest, which will include unrest of teachers of schools also, or are we considering mainly the position in the colleges?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, you can expunge that particular line, if you like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is right. The wording is:

"Further discussion on the increasing student unrest in the country.

Further discussion on the statement made by the Minister of State for Home Affairs in the House on the 7th December, 1972 regarding the incidents which took place in the Delhi University on the 6th December, 1972."

So, please do not make it very wide.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The Education Commission has very rightly pointed out:

"In our opinion, therefore, no reform is more important or more urgent than to transform education, to endeavour to relate it to the life, needs and aspirations of the people and thereby make it a powerful instrument of social, economical and cultural transformation necessary for their realization of our national goals. This can be done if education is related to productivity, strengthens social and national integration; consolidates democracy as a form of government and helps the country to adopt it as a way of life, hastens the process of modernisation and strives to build character by cultivating social, moral and spiritual values."

There are serious genuine grievances on the part of the students and teachers, which must be dealt with by the proper authorities. Now new colleges are opened and students are enrolled without having proper facilities. Because of the system of capitation, only the sons of the rich can get enrolment in some of the colleges, whatever their merit may be. The door of such institutions is closed for the poor. There is a terrific rise in tuition fees.

We have seen the instance of the Faridabad Medical College where 220 boys and girls have paid Rs. 20,000 each as capitation fee and tuition charges. The management of that institution has collected Rs. 44 lakhs, that money has been swallowed and the State has been patronising such people. Those students have made representation to the Government, to the Chief Minister of Haryana, but their grievances have not been remedied.

We had occasion to discuss what is happening at the Banaras Hindu University. The Yuva Congress are on the rampage. They have murdered Shri Uday Pratap Singh for political purposes.

There is foreign influence and infiltration of CIA. Delhi is an example. May I ask the hon. Minister what is the outcome of the talks with the Vice-Chancellor last evening?

For the Delhi University Students' Union elections, look how we corrupt them? Rs. 3 lakhs were spent; air flights were arranged; trips to hill stations were arranged. Still they got defeated. Some students say that the ruling party want to undo it.

There is police within the campus. When Prof. Nurul Hasan makes speeches here, at the same time, the police goes on beating up students inside the campus. The other day, on the 6th December, 1972, I am told—please correct me if I am wrong—that the Vice-Chancellor's room was filed with plain clothes' policemen long before the students came. It is the fault of the Government. I have got a note which says that the Vice-Chancellor writes a letter to Prof. Chakravarty on 8th December, 1972. "If we have not been able to set up the necessary bodies and procedures on the same, that is to say, to satisfy the student requirements the fault is of entirely our own."

One top leader of the Youth Wing of the Congress, of the ruling party, in a meeting in Delhi, during last week of November, had suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should be attacked. A ruling party M.P. patronising one section of the unruly element, as an outcome of the Congress factional fight, one of the top leaders of the ruling party, purchased, 35 Congress votes which just went to the Jana Sangh. Parallel politics are being run in Metropolitan Council. If the Congress had won Delhi University elections, one ruling Congress leader, M.P. thinks that he would have been the Chief of the Metropolitan Council.

How low they have gone. They have spent Rs. 3 lakhs on Delhi University Students' Union elections. Even the supply of drinks was made. One young boy Kaushik at first Independent 3rd candidate, opposing the Congress got Rs. 85,000 to join the Congress and he issued a statement in praise of the Prime Minister. One Bhagwan Singh, Jana Sangh supported candidate, on the eve of elections, was bought over by the Congress.

This is the sanctity of education. Even during British days, when you were fighting British people with your blood, Sir, the police did not enter educational institutions. Today, in West Bengal, there is no educational institution where the police has not got in. May I ask the hon. Minister: Is an attempt being made to create crisis and atmosphere to supersede the Delhi University Act? We want to know that.

There is police within the campus. Jacking for which the students are being blamed was engineered by intelligence agent provocateurs. We want to know that. A high-powered Parliamentary Committee is a must to go into these affairs. The whole country is in ferment. The Professors, the school teachers and the students have all been given a raw deal by the present Government. I condemn this

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu.]

Government and I insist that a high-powered Parliamentary Committee must be set up to enquire into this matter because it relates to the future generation of the country. The future of the country depends on students. We must give them a fair deal, a kindly deal and a fatherly deal.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola):

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the subject that we are discussing today has wider implications and, therefore, we will have to take into consideration the wider context of the entire issue if we really want to find solution to these aberrations that we see today in the student world.

Basically after our Independence, we had hoped that we will bring about a basic change in our approach to education. Formerly, we used to criticise the foreign rulers saying that they gave education that suited them, that they wanted to produce slaves, clerks, to serve the Empire. Thereafter, our entire purpose should have been to create citizens who build a new India. That is the basic purpose of our education which ought to have been achieved.

Education, basically, has two purposes. One is to elevate the individual to give him a wider vision, a wider perspective. That is the basic purpose of education, the universal purpose of education, which ought to be there for the universities. You may recall that Sanskrit sloka which we used to learn in our school days in praise of Goddess Saraswati. It is said:

कश्यपः प्रवृत्तः सप्तमिन् ।  
भक्त्या तं प्रसादतः कथयः ।  
पश्यति सुखमयः ।  
सा कथयति सरस्वती देवी ॥

That is the prayer we address to Goddess Saraswati:

"Praise be to the Goddess of learning with whose blessing the knowledgeable is able to perceive the whole earth as if it were a berry on the palm of his hand."

Has our education today in university or school, at any level, this purpose? Let us ask this question to ourselves.

Another purpose of education must be to equip the educated to be a useful member of the society, a useful citizen who will be able to play his role in the society. Are we giving that education? Is our education today purposive, job-oriented? What does a boy become after the education that he gets in school? I am not taking into consideration the kindergarten stage; from the age of 6 to the age of 16, the high school education that you give him, in ten valuable years how do you equip him? For what? Can he become a member of the society which is productive in any single field, contributing to the economic growth of the country? Can he become a wage-earning worker, a worthy member of the society? Actually today's education is making him unworthy of any work, unemployable instead of employable. That is what is happening. When boys reach the age of 16 or 18, why should every one want to go to University? It is just to get a degree because that degree promises him a job, a job as a clerk; even for the post of Peon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is about student unrest.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I began by referring to the basic context I am spelling out the context. Unless you understand the basic malady, unless you diagnose the disease, you cannot treat the disease.

Why is there this student unrest today? Today the university-educated boys or college-educated boys do not see any hope in playing a useful role in life. They cannot get jobs; they cannot find any work. The entire

educational system, if you do not want this unrest, must be so re-oriented that every boy getting out of the university should be able to do something productive, should be able to produce some goods. Today even if he wants he cannot get. Of course, there is the other context with which you are not concerned. But it must be coordinated with the policy of the Government of providing employment, useful employment, purposeful employment. You cannot do that because we are still slaves of the vested interests in the country who are controlling the entire productive resources of the country. Unless you do this, your education is going to be aimless.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You are saying about the class character of the Congress Party. I congratulate you on that.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I am talking of the basic issues.

Another important aspect is that the majority of the students today do not want violence or unrest. Let me say this. You also must be knowing it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please try to conclude.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: How much more time can I take?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only two minutes more.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I have spoken only for five minutes. The other member took 30 minutes. Anyway, I will obey you....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may finish in two minutes.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: If you want, Sir, I can sit down now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can finish your speech.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Another important point which I wanted to mention was this. The majority of

the students in this country do not want violence, do not want unrest. Today they see a ray of hope in the leadership of the country. You must have seen that this age group, in which the university students are there, stood massively behind the leader of the nation. Why? Because they know that here is the leadership which can help them mobilise their energy to become builders of the nation. I would, therefore, submit that even in the university campus, it is only a handful who indulge in violence, provoked by people outside, provoked by people who are interested in provoking violence. The majority of the students do not want violence. —But why are the majority of the students not with us? Why are the majority of the students not with the teachers? Why are the majority of the students not with the Vice-Chancellor? As the old Chinese saying goes, if the son goes wrong, punish the father. I would say, 'Yes, if Students go wrong, punish the teacher.' He is the real guilty man to-day. The Vice-Chancellor or the teacher—why are they not able to invoke the confidence in the majority of the students? That only means that there is something seriously wrong with our Vice-Chancellors and teachers. They also do not have. ✓  
(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No disturbance please.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: ✓ The last point I want to make is that we must involve the students and the student population in some nation-building mass programmes. That would be a very good method of channelising and mobilising the energies of the students. You know there are organisations and we cannot just wish them away. They catch the boys young, poison their mind, put them in narrow grooves in the name of nationalism, communal or otherwise. They do this by catching the boys at the age

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

of six or earlier. Now, by simply saying that this thing ought to be condemned, we cannot wish them away. What is the alternative you are providing? Where are they? Formerly, we used to have Akharas in every Mohalla where we could imbue the students not only physically but actually with certain values. But, today, what are the avenues for our young men to go to? Today, in the colleges you will find for extra-curricular activities, there is no place and all that the boys have to do or most of them do, is to go and stand in the street corner. That is also a major lacuna and a draw-back.

✓ Lastly, in this context, you must give a feeling of belonging and participation to the students. If a student can be a citizen and even though he cannot vote today but if he is of the voting age, why cannot he be in the Senate? Why cannot he be in the College Council? Why cannot he be in the University-controlling executive or whatever body it is? Let him have that feeling of belonging and only then he will know directly where the shoe is pinching and the students' problems can be solved on the spot. That ought to be done. That is the last suggestion I would make if you want to solve this students' unrest. ✓

Therefore, I submit that we have to tackle the students' agitation that way and as far as unruly violence is concerned, I think nobody has said that they support violence—even the other side said that—or encourage them. Therefore, as far as the stand of the Government against the hooligans, against the *goondas*, against rowdies and against those who commit violence is concerned, I support entirely the stand of the Government. Don't tolerate any *goondas* or any violence on the campus, at least in the precincts of the University. . . . (Interruptions) But those basic questions have to be considered. You cannot tackle the students and their problems unless you look at them in the larger context.

Thank you very much.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): I was feeling surprised by the number of statements that are made by the hon. Minister for Education on the floor of the House. A very soft man and himself a professor, how can he take such a strong attitude of iron-rod treatment with the students?

Also I was feeling surprised how the Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University, coming from the teaching profession, should take the posture of a superintendent of police in dealing with the students. I got the answer to it yesterday and how the Education Minister and the Vice-Chancellor got the cue and where from. I got it yesterday.

I was simply stunned by the statement that was made by the hon. Home Minister when he said, 'Be harsh, be strict' like a bureaucrat. I think all the bureaucrats will be very pleased to hear him. What did he say? "Students' violence will not be tolerated in the University campus." They think as if the student unrest is a phenomenon of habitual criminality. The Home Minister spoke as if they were dealing with a set of habitual criminals. I am sorry to say that of late, particularly, in dealing with Delhi University and Banaras Hindu University regarding the student unrest, the Government has taken an attitude as if the problem of student unrest is a problem of law and order, a problem of political dereliction. I will firstly take up the second point. I want to get this information from the hon. Education Minister who has got cue from the Home Minister to be rigid, to be firm in their attitude to students. Let the ruling party answer this question about their political influence among the student community, by placing their hands on their hearts. Today, the revival of the ruling congress rests very largely on the active contribution of the student community in



favour of that party. The example is known to every one. There is the role of the Chhatra Parishad; there is the role of the Yuv Congress. I do not want to go into the details. If you go on harping on all these things, it will recoil on you. I do not want to use a strong language, but I wish that they should keep their house in order. I know other political parties also do it. When they started this in Delhi and Banaras Hindu University, we have pointed out, be careful; if you try to take up the active cooperation of the student community, it will recoil on you. The student community has got a general fraternity of service among themselves, a general affiliation among themselves, cutting across the party barriers. If you go on harping like this, it will recoil on you.

Secondly, about the question of violence, I want to know this from him. There is unrest everywhere; unrest is a sign of the times. If there is violence we will not condone it. If there is excess, we will not condone it. We will deplore it very much. You cannot equate student unrest and student violence with violence committed by other criminal elements. If you do that, you are committing violence against the fundamental nature of youth. Youth cannot be controlled by your iron law. That is the lesson of history.

Now, Sir, what is the basic reason for the student unrest in the country? It is known to the Education Minister. The basic reason is, the object, the ideal, and the system of education is very 'back-dated' and very 'outmoded', I should say. The whole system of education has almost virtually turned into a junk. It is not easy for me to go into the details. But I want to quote a few lines from their own words. Here is the report of the U.G.C. This has come out after the Kothari Commission Report. It says:

"Dissatisfaction has become particularly acute among students because of unemployment among the educated youth, particularly the growing unemployment of the technically trained personnel. The present system of education appears to lack any concrete aim or purpose and to be a mere ritual devoid of inner strength and reality....."

It further says that there is hence "a demand for a change in the syllabus, the structure of courses, the system of examinations and methods of teaching.....". This is to be seen:

"...in respect of outmoded and old-fashioned syllabuses or courses which do not appeal to the students. These courses are neither satisfactory in developing the intellect of the student nor in equipping him for the needs of society. The dissatisfaction of the students with society in general and with the existing academic opportunities in particular can easily be exploited by interested faction leaders within the academic community as well as those without and this leads to the eruption of agitations based on regional, linguistic or communal demands."

I would like to point out that the violence as it appears today is just a symptom; it is not the malady. The malady is deep-rooted, and the malady has been indicated by the UGC's report. If you consider the question from the point of view of students' participation, then there is a big job to be done. I do not want to quote further from the UGC's report. But I would like to ask Government what they have done with it. Have they dealt with this question? Have they been able to get students' participation? If they could have got it, then certainly, I would not say that everything would have been achieved, but at least a major part of the student's unrest could have been dealt with.

[Shri Samar Guha]

The hon. Minister had asked one question namely whether we were dealing with the teachers' problems or the problem of student unrest....

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: My question was in regard to the school teachers.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I would like to point out how teachers' unrest can be converted into students' unrest. The Delhi students' trouble is a glaring example of this. The whole problem started from the Engineering College. It was the teachers of the Delhi Engineering College who were on strike. You will be surprised to know that there were very few students who wanted the college to be closed. They wanted the college to be reopened. They went to meet the Chief Executive Councillor of the Metropolitan Council. He told them to wait for fifteen days. And what did he do? He said 'I am dismissing all the professors and teachers and then bringing in new teachers, and then everything will be all right.' But everything was not all right. Within the next few days, when the students went there, what did they do? I shall not call him a gentleman, but I shall call him a person with a thick-headed behaviour. I do not want to use any stronger words. That person with the thick-headed behaviour created the first trouble. The first trouble was that he was not there. When the students went to meet him, he had escaped. I have got this from the Congress friends only. I have got all the information from my Congress friends only. I do not look at this problem from the party standpoint. The students were given a good beating when they went to see the Vice-Chancellor thinking that they could have their grievances redressed. The Vice-Chancellor had escaped, and the students got a good beating. The students then came away. Again, that jittery fellow did not meet them; I should say that the Vice

Chancellor is nothing but a jittery nervous fellow. He did not do anything.

The Lt. Governor then himself took the initiative. He had a talk with the members of the Metropolitan Council, and he almost solved all the problems. He agreed that the grievances of the Delhi Engineering College teachers were very genuine, because they wanted to be on the same salary scale and they wanted to have the same status as the university teachers. All the problems were solved. He said that the other demands would be negotiated. Then, he suggested to the vice-chancellor to keep in abeyance or to withdraw the rustication order. But he did not. On the 5th this happened. On the 6th,—as you know, the students always talk of something grandiose, and they talked of grandiose and the take-over of the university. When the students were going there, there was a big grandiose, and there was a big drama there. If only the vice-chancellor would have heeded the advice of the Lt. Governor, perhaps the problem would have been solved. But he did not. When the students were going to disperse, about forty to fifty plain-clothes people who were already in the room of the Vice-Chancellor pounced upon the students. The vice-chancellor had made at least half a dozen calls to the police to come to the campus. And the police came. What did they do? I do not want to say anything on my own, but I shall only quote from the newspapers. The report is:

"Two battalions of policemen were asked to descend on the Delhi University campus. They came teargassing, chasing crowds, harassing passers-by, cane-charging, ing, the stragglers, beating the students to blood, assaulting even the pressmen, insulting the lady-teachers, belabouring, bawling and abusing whosoever came in their way."

I am concluding. That is why I say it hurts me. The Vice-Chancellor also belongs to my profession. I always used to say about him: police superintendent. This jittery man has bungled every thing. You know this man rusticated two Jan Sangh and two Congress—perhaps he did not know—evenly balanced. He has been caught in his own mess. Yesterday four educationists, members of the executive council belonging to all parties, the two contending parties together, went to the Vice-Chancellor to make an appeal to him: make a review committee and keep the rustriation in abeyance and the problem will be solved. The Vice-Chancellor said to the Lt. Governor: No, no; I will withdraw the rustriation in the month of January, not now. This is his attitude to the students a man without having even a little bit of paternal affection or paternal perspective. How can you entrust such a man to deal with the students? We had our Acharya Narendra Dev. There was a teacher and the taught. The most important part is to deal with the students. I request the hon. Education Minister to give up the attitude of treating students with an iron rod and making it a law and order issue, political issue. Look not at the symptom but at the basic malady with which the whole students community is today infected.

SRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): Sir, I will not take much time. There are two problems before us: One is about the general student unrest in the country; secondly, the particular incident in the Delhi University. The first question is too large to be exhaustively discussed within the compass of a one hour discussion in Parliament.

I should say that I do not feel alarmed of the much talked about students unrest throughout the country. Looking back, this is not a new phenomenon at all. If only we took a retrospective view, it will

be possible for us to recollect that throughout the very years we have lived, we have seen from year to year, place to place, era to era student unrest breaking out in some form or another in different areas in the country... (*Interruptions*). Most of us who are here were involved in our student days in this. May be on a national issue or individual issue.

What I am saying is that the general atmosphere in the country will find its reflection on the student community also. The unrest among the students is not a feature peculiar to India. You take any country, any part of the world. You find the student community in ferment in some form or another. India is not an exception. It is not the student community alone which is in ferment; different sectors of the community in the different countries, advanced and advancing, developed and developing in different stages of cultural development are all affected because it is a dynamic process. Progress does not stop any where. It is a dynamic thing, going from stage to stage. You are in a particular stage and your horizon widens and unrest develops. Discontentment and unrest, there will always be. Different demands may be met, but still many may remain. Without that, you may take it that society is dead.

10.00 hrs.

So far as this problem is concerned, different propositions have been put forth. It is not as if Government is unaware of it. Commissions have been appointed and proposals have been made. In different universities many proposals have been implemented. In Kerala the students wanted representation in the syndicate. It was accepted. They wanted representation in different councils. It was also accepted. Not only in Kerala but in many other universities also, many demands of the students have been accepted, though there may be difference in the degree of implementation.

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

But still, the student community is not perfectly satisfied and they still look forward to something more. That is inherent in the whole situation. If that is so, the major question is; how the elders are going to react to a particular manifestation. I am sure everybody will agree that the approach must not be the rule of the rod. No sensible government of police force can take that attitude. When there is a spontaneous outbreak, no body runs with a rifle or a rod. Those incidents are very few. Looking at the large number of educational institutions functioning from Kashmir to Kanyakumari, the spots of unrest are comparatively few. Let us not magnify it out of its proper context and proportion. It is not national sort of demonstration. It is limited to certain developments in that particular area, but even then an analysis must be made whether the mass of the students in that particular area want their studies to be interrupted. As Mr. Sathe pointed out, it is not the mass of students who want it. I am not putting the students who are responsible for the manifestation in the dock. That is far from my contemplation. I am only saying that the mass of students do not want it. Some people susceptible to emotions and machinations do a particular thing. If a particular incident takes place, what is the attitude the elders take? If my child misbehaves, I do not take a big rod and beat the child. I tell him that what he has done is wrong. If that is the role of the elders, have we played that role?

Take the Delhi University incident. A particular students' organisation makes an advance announcement, "We are going to march to the university to take over the administration." The announcement may be justified or not. But was there any political party in the country which came out and commented on it? Is it that you have approved of it? If it was not approved by any political party, as elders, was it or was it not our duty to react to that and tell

the students, "Your grievances may be genuine, but your programme of taking over the university is something we completely discountenance. We raise our voice against it. Stop it." So, no political party, which has not discharged that responsibility as elders, has got the right to point a finger of accusation at the students. It is not the students who are in the dock. It is the Congress, the Jan Sangh, the Communist Party or any other party which claims to be an adult which is in the dock. We have failed in discharging our responsibility, as elders, of mustering the moral courage to tell the youngsters that what they are doing is absolute-ly wrong. That has not been done. Let us stop playing to the gallery because this is a very delicate matter. It is the future of our children that we are playing with. One could understand that when the national movement was on, but not now. Then, it is not as if the government is not prepared to respond. The government, the mass of the people and the university, they are prepared to react, and they are reacting. But it will have to be solved stage by stage. The methods adopted for the purpose of solution also have to be different. If they do not accord with our concepts of civilisation and evolutionary process, then every party must say whether it approves of that procedure or not. Otherwise, we will not be discharging our duties and responsibilities. That is all I have got to say on this aspect.

Much was said about the Vice Chancellor. I do not know that gentleman. In my view the Vice-Chancellor should buck up moral courage and say "I am offering myself to be butchered; let the students do whatever they want". In that case, the students and also the public would have second thoughts. But when the political parties do not have the moral courage to say that their programme is wrong in the fear that the students might react against them, those political parties

have no moral right to except of a lone Vice-Chancellor to offer himself to be massacred by the students. In this case the Vice-Chancellor did not run away from the scene. He waited. But then he found that the students were on the rampage and he was in mortal danger of being attacked and killed. So, he summoned the police.

When the Vice-Chancellor summons the police, saying that his life is in danger and some students are ransacking the university building, if he seeks the assistance of the arms of the law, can the government say that it is a matter between the Vice-Chancellor and the students and that we will not interfere? Could the police react in that way in such a situation? Here the question is not whether the Vice-Chancellor is correct or not. He may or may not be correct. The fact of the matter is that the Vice-Chancellor told the police that his life is in danger and the property of the university is being damaged by the students. When the police receive such s.o.s. from the Vice-Chancellor, how should it react? I would repeat that let nobody who at different stages did not discharge their moral responsibility to the youngsters, come forward with a sanctimonious demonstration of rising on the pinnacle of moral perfection and start lecturing others who, in their limited fashion are trying to discharge their responsibility as per their contemplation and visualisation.

Coming to the students, everybody knows that there is discontent among them. But that is not a problem concerning the students alone. Neither is discontent peculiar to Indian students alone. Discontentment there will ever be, so long as dynamic life and dynamic societies go on; perfection there will never be. But the discontentment has got to be solved in a democratic and peaceful manner. If violent methods are adopted for the solution of discontentment,

you will throw the society to pieces and progress will be retarded. So long as democracy functions here and there is responsiveness, there is an avenue for solving these problems. If you are trying to by-pass that, then there will be no future for us. I can understand the emotional students functioning or behaving in that way. But if those persons who are supposed to function with a sense of moral responsibility, if they in their anxiety to get cheaply bought political applause start encouraging such behaviour, they would be doing a disservice more to their children than to the students. This is my reaction on this subject.

**SHRI RANABAHADUR SINGH** (Sidhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in any democracy if certain upheavals like the one that we have just witnessed in this very city did not happen, then I feel that that democracy is dead. It has to come as a part of the evolutionary process wherein a nation gradually evolves its methods of education to take society to that particular place where the maximum benefit accrues to the maximum number of people.

I feel that it is a legacy of democratic processes that things are tackled as they want. One person has aptly named this process as *ad hoc* crazy. What happens in our country is no exception to this rule which is almost common in all democracies.

Twenty-five years after Independence, the question of student unrest has taken on a shape and, probably, we also at this stage are having more time on our hands wherein we can really apply ourselves to questions which have so long been begging to be looked into. So, at this moment, it is a welcome opportunity that the student unrest has caused a debate in our society and in this august House apart from the fact that other solutions which have exercised the Members of this House too and which have to be decried wherein the strong

[Shri Rana Bahadur Singh.]

arm of the law has finally tried to solve the student problem by the only method known to them.

I feel that it is in the context of this debate that a few points should be studied. All this debate that has taken place here has initially revolved round one basic aspect and that is economic aspect. Every Member has tried to make out that our education fails to provide job-oriented education to our young people. I do not think that a developing country like ours is in a position for the next 15 to 20 years to provide meaningful jobs to all the students who graduate from our universities. It is impossible. Our coffers have no money for that.

To talk all the time of providing job-oriented education to the students invariably creates the problem that we are putting it into their minds that once they come out of universities, they are fit to get jobs. The total thinking of students is an end product of our educational process. What is our educational process? When we talk about reforms, we only reach the stage wherein we try to create a job-oriented feeling for the students who come out of our universities. Even when we have created job-orientation feeling in our students, that they will get their jobs, that problem is something which must be looked into now because what we are facing as a student problem today is an accumulated result of our policies for the last 25 years and what is going to be the nature of this problem 20 years from now is manageable today.

So, when we talk about reforms in education, it is time that we stop giving mammon the central place in this whole theory. It is time that a student who goes to college should come out with something more in him than the mere single-mindedness of trying to get money to achieve a certain standard of life. I do not at this moment think nor do I plead that we

use the age-old soporific to dull the minds of students. That is not my plea. But I do feel that this job orientation and worship of Mammon that is inculcated in the students by our educational process should, at this time, be somehow reduced, and when a student comes out of the university, he should not be a wage-earning machine wanting the processes of that earning, but he should have that adjustment in him which as per our present thinking and our information those students do develop in the Western societies.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: He should conclude.

SHRI RANABAHADUR SINGH: This is the last sentence.

The more affluent societies in the West are producing a type of students with whom economics is no longer the basic primary factor. I do not think that it is quite achievable in the near future by us. All that I wish to draw the attention of the Government to is that they can only solve this problem by going deep into it and by not closing their minds to the fact that job orientation is not the only answer.

*Madhulekha*  
SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I welcome this debate on student unrest because I think it is very useful and necessary that we in this country discuss the problems that are faced by our young generation. This problem of student unrest is not peculiarly an Indian problem. It is a problem which is a global phenomenon and it arises out of many causes. It is also true that the university campuses all over the world today are, so to speak, *en rapport* with each other: if something happens in Brazil, it has its repercussions in Japan; if something happens in Europe, it has its repercussions in Asia. This, in a sense, is good because when students all over the place feel restless, they also know that they are belonging to

the new times where everybody thinks that he or she belongs to the new whole world. So, let us have this larger perspective in view.

Secondly, I do not think it will be right to look at this problem from any partisan or political angle. I concede that political overtures cannot altogether be avoided because this problem of student unrest is caused not only by educational factors but also by political, economic, social, cultural and religious factors—all kinds of factors have combined. But I want to view this problem from a strictly non-partisan angle; and if I may say in all humility, I have been teaching and lecturing in colleges and Universities for the last 23 years and, therefore, I may claim some knowledge of, and close acquaintance with, the problem of student unrest.

Student unrest is not necessarily bad or unhealthy. Indeed, some unrest is to be welcomed when the unrest is for change, for dynamism, for meaningful dialogue and for purposeful endeavour. It is only when unrest takes a turn towards violence and destruction that we feel that it is to be criticised and avoided. We must make a distinction between unrest and violence. It is very necessary that our young people should have a sense of law; they should respect public property and see to it that it is not destroyed. Therefore, unrest and violence have to be separated. Violence has to be punished. But I want to ask this hon. House and all concerned whether we are aware of the deeper violence, the violence which stems out of breach of promises by the elders, by the university bodies, by government leaders, by various political parties, the violence that stems from the delays caused by the machineries in the Government or University //.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member may try to conclude.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I do not want to take much time. If you allow me a couple of minutes more...

MR. CHAIRMAN: He can take ~~two~~ minutes more.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I was saying that we must be aware of the violence which arises from the deeper malady of the society.

Teachers also are responsible to an extent because unless there is quality and integrity on the part of the teachers, I do not think the students will be able to have the satisfaction of learning. ✓

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member's time is up. ✓

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Only two more points and I have finished.

I want to suggest that the unrest also is caused by the fact that there is a tremendous lack of communication between the teachers and the students and between the elders and the youth.

The dialogue with the students is so necessary, and, in certain respects, with the growing generation it is absolutely necessary. A very humane and a personal feeling of intense warmth and understanding for the students is required and the students must be made to feel that they are also being cared for by the elders and the educational authorities and, further, that the elders have a sense of concern for them. If all this happens, the problem of students' unrest can be, if not avoided, at least partly solved. We must also give our students a chance to participate in the various academic bodies and the various allied activities.

Let us not forget that the students are restless all over the world, not only because they are finding fault in the University matters. In fact, the youth the world over are restless because the youth of the modern times have a special interest which they have acquired and they have become hypocrisy-hunters. Wherever they see it, whether it be in the elders or

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]  
in the leaders, they spot them out  
and revolt against them.

Therefore, I suggest that this problem of students' unrest should not be looked at only from the point of view of partisanship or from political overtones. We must look at it from the larger angle, from the international angle. Here, I would like to quote what Prof. Arnold Toynbee says in his very fine and recent book 'Surviving the Future'. He says the youth possess two qualities which they must contrive to retain:

"The virtues of youth are disinterestedness and open-uninterestedness. Hold on to them."

With these two qualities, if our younger generation can be encouraged to go forward, I am sure, all will be well with India and the world.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री एम. राम गोपाल रेड्डी (निजामा-  
वाद) : जो कुछ दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी में या  
दूसरी जगह हो रहा है वह बहुत ही दुखदायक  
है। इसका कारण यह है कि हम लोगों में,  
टीचर्स में और विद्यार्थियों में सोचने की शक्ति  
कम हो रही है। यही एक चीज है। नेहरू जी  
ने कई बार कहा था कि मुल्क में किसी भी  
चीज की कमी हो जाए, कोई परवाह नहीं है  
लेकिन थिकिंग पावर, सोचने की शक्ति  
अगर कम हो जाए तो बड़ी मुसीबत होगी।  
आज हमारी यूनिवर्सिटीज में सोचने की शक्ति  
कम हो गई है। बुद्धि जीवी जो हैं उनको  
इस ओर ध्यान देना चाहिये जो नहीं दिया जा  
रहा है। दो ही चीजें आज प्रमुख मान ली  
गई हैं। विद्यार्थी चाहते हैं कि बिना पढ़े लिखे  
काम करके वे पास हो जाएं और सेक्चरार  
चाहते हैं कि बिना पढ़ाए उनको तनख्वाह मिल  
जाए। यही दो चीजें हो रही हैं। बद-  
किश्मती से कुछ पोलिटिकल ह्राथ भी उस में  
हैं। राजनीतिक दल और मजदूरों में,  
कर्मचारियों में जा कर काम करने को कोई एतराज

की बात नहीं है लेकिन मेरी विनती है कि  
आप जरा इन लोगों से अलग हीं रहे, इनको  
जरा इनके हाथ से बचायें और बच्चों को अपने  
हाल में हीं रहने दें। मुझे नहीं मालूम कि  
श्री बसु जी के कितने बच्चे हैं, हम चाहते हैं  
कि उनके जो बच्चे हैं, जो पढ़ रहे हैं, वे  
उनकी तरह से हीं अच्छे स्पीकर बने  
पढ़ लिख कर विद्वान बने। लेकिन  
मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर बच्चा  
हड़ताल करता है, पत्थर मारता है, वस  
जलाता है तो किस किस का बच्चा वह  
आगे चल कर बनेगा। जब हम इसको सोचते  
हैं तो जरा डर लगता है। आंध्र में बच्चे  
बहुत आजाद हो गये हैं, ब्रॉं जलाते हैं, वहां  
यूनिवर्सिटी बन्द होती रहती है। इस वास्ते  
मैंने अपने बच्चे को लाकर यहां दिल्ली  
विश्वविद्यालय में दाखिल करा दिया।  
पहले साल तो वह अच्छा पढ़ा लेकिन दूसरे  
साल यह हालत हो गई है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि  
पालिटिक्स हमारे विश्वविद्यालयों में न पढ़ें।  
मेहरबानी करके हर आदमी अपनी हद में रहे।  
यह फ्यूचर जैनरेशन का सबाल है।

कहा जा रहा है कि विश्व में सब जगह  
ऐसा ही हो रहा है। विभव में होता होगा  
लेकिन भारतवर्ष में नहीं होना चाहिये,  
यही मेरी आपसे विनती है ॥

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION,  
SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE  
(PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): Sir, a  
very large number of points have been  
raised by hon. Member. I would have  
liked to deal with each and every one  
of the points, but some of them have  
not found it worth their while to sit  
here and to listen to whatever sub-  
mission I have to make to you. Sir,  
the most important criticism was made  
by Shri Jagannath Rao Joshi of the  
Jan Sangh.

SHRI HEMENDRA SINGH BANE-  
RA (Bhilwara): I am here to represent  
him.



PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: If this is the Parliamentary tradition which we want to establish, I have no objection.

SHRI HEMENDRA SINGH BANERAJA: He has gone for some important work; I am representing him.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: This kind of proxy will not do.

PROF. NURUL HASAN: I will start with the points that have been raised by those hon. Members who have taken the trouble of being present here and then, in passing, I will take up points of those who are not present. First of all, I want to take up the point of my distinguished friend, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): You have well used the word 'distinguished'....

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: The word 'distinguished' is correct and the word 'friend' is correct and he cannot deny this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Thank you.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I want to draw his attention to a slight inaccuracy of historical fact in what he said. He said that during the British days the Police did not enter the campus. I was a student during British days. I have seen police enter the campus. I have seen police beat us up all. In 1942 I was just a young lecturer trying to protect, to the best of my ability, the students of my university from police firing and from all the other beatings. And, Sir, there are many number of people of my generation and older in this House who could never have forgotten.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The British seldom entered educational institutions. Did you forget about Principal Dr. Erquhart refusing entry

of Sir Charles Teggard, Police Commissioner into his college? Sir Charles Teggard was later the Vice-Chancellor of Calcutta University.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I don't think that my hon. friend should become an apologist for British rule.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am not. You are following all their bad habits. You are making it still worse.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I think that when such a serious matter is discussed, even for securing a debating point, factual inaccuracy should not creep in. The hon. Member made another very important reference. He quoted that one-third of the student disturbances were for better facilities, one-third were for failed students and dismissed staff and one-third for larger issues. Now, I want to crave your indulgence to refer to what is called the larger issues. These figures are tentative. No detailed survey could have been made in such a short time, but may be, it gives us some rough indication. Between the period June 1972 and November, 1972 there were 4136 cases reported of what may be called broadly, student unrest. Among these, the incidents of serious trouble because of regional, linguistic, communal, parochial and chauvinistic factors, were 1395. That is to say, more than one-third of the total incidents that have taken place have not taken place because of a demand for something which is progressive, because of any demand which has anything to do with the campus or the organisation of the university, but for issues which divide one section of our people against another.

This is a very serious matter, and I am putting forward this matter in all humility. Again, I have no intention to score debating points against various political parties. It is a matter for very serious consideration that within the short span of about six months or slightly under six months, there have been 1395 incidents where the issue is an issue which poses a threat and a

[Prof. Nurul Hasan]

danger to the advancement and progress of the country. It does not matter how we conceive of the advance, but anything which leads to a trouble on a parochial issue, or on a linguistic issue or for instance, the issue of the mulki rules has to be seriously considered. The mulki rules may be approved of or may not be approved of. But basically, what is the essence? How many of the jobs are going to one brother and how many are to go to the other brother?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That is the economic crisis created by you.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: That is not an economic crisis. Let him please try and understand. There is the role of ideology which is an important thing, and if the hon. Member has forgotten his Lenin, I cannot help him.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: He has never studied Lenin.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I seek his forgiveness....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Shri C. M. Stephen is the *sub-janta* for the Congress party in office.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I seek the forgiveness of the hon. Member, because I should not have presumed that he had studied Lenin.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): The hon. Minister has not understood Lenin properly. He has understood Lenin very wrongly, because the economic basis is the primary thing in Lenin. Let him please try to go deep into the matter.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I never thought that I was going to throw pearls before swans.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I can easily repeat this compliment. Once

upon a time I thought that the hon. Member had made a careful study. Apparently, under the responsibility of political leadership .... (Interruptions)

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: I am unfortunately constrained to say that that is why his place is on the other side.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I never knew that I had thrown pearls before swans.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: That is a very bad word. It may be expunged. He cannot use that expression.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: \* \* \*

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will not go on record. What he has said about Shri Raj Bahadur and the way he has put it will not go on record. He has got a very bad habit of putting it. Let it not be put on record. I am not allowing that to go on record.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: He does not understand the English idiom. What can I do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is very bad.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: It is an English idiom, Sir. I said 'swans'.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him leave it now, and let him allow the hon. Minister to continue.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I would also like to draw the attention of Shri Jyotirmay Bosu to what Plekhanov has written and to what criticism of economism....

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The hon. Minister should realise that we do not all subscribe to the economic theory of the development of either intellect or civilisation or the values of life. There are other contributions also. So, let him not harp on our ideological convictions. We do not subscribe to that theory.

\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Let him say so, but let him not refer to Lenin.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: We have also got our ideological convictions.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY: Lenin is not the property of anyone, but it is world property.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: The hon. Member appears to have taken a patent.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: He means monopolists? They are their patron-saints.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: The point is that a dangerous ideology is developing, and it is necessary that we should take note of it, and we should at every necessary step put a stop to this sort of ideology for exploiting the masses of our students.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Let him explain it a little further. What is the ideology?

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: There were two specific questions which Mr. Jyotirmay Bosu asked the Government. Does the Government intend to supersede the Delhi University? The answer is: Government has no such intention. Secondly, was hijacking an act of agent provocateur? I have already made the statement, when one of the hon. Members said that it was an act of agent provocateur, that it was not in accordance with the facts as were known to us. If the hon. Member has any evidence I shall be grateful if he would let me have that evidence because I will not tolerate any agent provocateur to create disturbances... (Interruptions). Then there is to be a 'but' also. But if these statements are made light-heartedly they could create misunderstandings and a great deal of difficulty. Therefore, the hon. Members must check up their facts before they make such statements.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What I said, I said with a full sense of responsibility.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: Another interesting point put forward by my distinguished friend Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu is that when he spoke he referred to lack of funds with the managing committees of private colleges. I never realised that he was such a defender of private enterprise in education. I would not like to comment any further.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am not a defender of private education; I only stated facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is how it becomes difficult; you do not co-operate with the Chair.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I fully co-operate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this the attitude? We are sitting late all the time. In the place of two hours allotted, we have taken four hours and more. Still you are not satisfied and go on giving a running commentary on that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Do you appreciate that I have not challenged the quorum.... (Interruptions).

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: Shri S. N. Mishra pointing a finger at me asked: when Mr. V. V. John was assaulted in Jaipur did you raise your voice? My answer is a categorical yes. I immediately sent him a telegram and I did raise my voice because of the reasons I am going to discuss which I consider to be the basic and fundamental reasons.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The outcome of your meeting with the Vice Chancellor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot help yourself!

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You have found it out; I am in full agreement with you.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I do not think I have enough time to deal with the points of Members who are not present; therefore I shall leave them and deal with the other points

SHRI HAMENDRA SINGH BANERA: He has to reply to all the points raised by the Members of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot force the Minister.

SHRI HAMENDRA SINGH BANERA: On a point of order; certainly he will have to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order... (*Interruptions*).

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I would like to refer to two small points before I go on to the fundamental points raised by Mr. Samar Guha. Firstly, the point which I thought in reply to the calling attention I made explicitly clear apparently has escaped his attention. On the 14th November, the students' group went to the university and for that, the hon. member used the words "the Vice-Chancellor escaped". The Vice-Chancellor had a previous lecture engagement at quite some distance from Delhi. When he returned after 7 o'clock in the evening, only then he heard what had happened. Therefore, the impression that the Vice-Chancellor escaped is factually incorrect.

I would very briefly deal with the problem of Delhi University before I take up the other problems. My colleague, the Minister of State for Home Affairs, has already discussed at length the incidents of the 8th December and therefore, I need not take further time of the House on that. But there are three or four factors which may be of interest to

the House which have happened. On the 6th December, after the students had given an ultimatum to the university that they want to take over the administration... (*Interruptions*).

I cannot help admiring Mr. Bosu...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have to keep the House amused to prevent the point of quorum being raised.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: There is a line in Urdu.

'इस सादगी पर कौन न मर जाए ए खुदा'

اِس سادگی پر کون نہ مر جائے اے خدا

The Vice-Chancellor wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Students' Union saying that he wanted a committee of teachers' and students' representatives to discuss all the problems facing the students. That letter was, I regret to say, rejected by the student leadership which happened to me at that time present. Subsequently the Vice-Chancellor requested the President of the Delhi University Teachers' Association to intervene and try to bring about normalcy. The Delhi University Teachers' Association approached the students' union and said, "Let us form a Joint Committee consisting of the representatives of our two associations and try to look into all the problems with which the university was concerned." The student's union sought clarifications on a number of points, which clarifications were given by the President of the Delhi University Teachers' Association. Until now unfortunately the students have neither responded to the invitation given by the Vice-Chancellor to join a teacher-student committee to look into the problems of the students nor have they chosen to join the committee proposed by the President of the Teachers' Association.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Withdraw the rustication order.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I am coming to that.

I will now come to the restitution order. When a delegation of the representatives of students, which included all the office-bearers met me we agreed on three fundamental points in our discussions. The representatives of the students as well as myself felt that these were basic and fundamental points on which agreement was essential, and the students in their conversation with me agreed on them. These points are, firstly, that there is no place for violence and intimidation in the university; secondly, any student who is guilty of violence and intimidation should be rusticated from the university; and thirdly, because a person happens to be the elected representative of students, it does not, for that reason, give him any immunity from the normal processes of the rules of the university; that is to say, neither should any student be punished only because he is an elected representative, nor should he escape punishment only because he is an elected representative. The students agreed there is the threat of violence and inwith these three propositions.

Then I put forward before them the point of view that the issue, therefore, is not the withdrawal of the rustication order *per se* the issue is whether against whom rustication order has been passed were, in fact, guilty or they were not guilty. That is the basic issue. I then told them that the university had appointed a three-member enquiry committee which went into the evidence. The evidence was made available to the students. They could have made such representation, or put forward such evidence or arguments, before the enquiry committee as they liked. But, except one student, the other four—against whom notices had been given, did not care even to present themselves there. The enquiry committee, on the basis of facts, came to the conclusion that these students were guilty of violence and of incitement to violence.

SHRI HAMENDRA SINGH BANERA: All motivated statements.

2886 LS—13.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: This is a legalistic approach.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: We know who are the politically motivated people. We know exactly the people who are, at the present moment, creating trouble, who are the disruptionist elements among the students, who are preventing them from taking a path of reasonableness, responding either to the invitation of the Delhi University Teachers' Association or to the invitation of the Vice-Chancellor. The inner story is too sordid to be related here. I will spare the House this unpleasantness.

Then I said that the statutes of the Delhi University make it absolutely clear that any representation can be made to the Executive Council, any grievances can be represented to the Executive Council, and the Executive Council has every authority to look into any grievances of an individual student or a body of students and to redress those grievances, if it thinks fit. Therefore, I said that those who feel that action has been wrongly taken against them, let them go to the Executive Council, let them give their evidence before the Executive Council, put forward their argument before the Executive Council. If they feel that they have not been given a proper chance to defend themselves, let them bring out these facts before the Executive Council. As I have said, I have no reason to think that the Executive Council would not give them a very fair deal. I had further talks with the Vice-Chancellor and he has himself taken the view that the Executive Council will not only be fair but will also appear to be fair, which are both ingredients of justice. This how the matter stands in regard to students.

I now wish to take up the more fundamental question which has been

[Prof. S. Nurul Hasan] raised by the hon. Members and to which, I think, every Member has made some contribution. It would not be possible for me to recount individual names and say that these are the important points that have been made by each of them. But I would like to take up the point which several hon. Members have made and that is the question of unrest and violence.

I would like the hon. Members to distinguish between unrest and violence. Violence is not merely a philosophical concept that has to be examined in a vacuum. If in an academic institution there is violence and there is a group of individuals who say, "If you do not do this, we will break open your head or we will force you to do this or do that", then the intellectual life of that institution will come to an end. This is the basic moral question: Is the university a place where ideas are put forward, where there is a dissent, where there is a cross fertilisation of ideas, where arguments are matched against arguments or is it a place where there is going to be the threat of physical violence? If the threat of physical violence continues, then no university will be able to function. Therefore, I would like to appeal to this House to distinguish between two types of problems, the problem of unrest on the one hand and the problem of violence on the other hand.

Violence is to be condemned in any democratic society. An academic institution can just not function in an atmosphere of violence. If there is violence, that violence will have to be put down. The question that has to be answered the question the Vice-Chancellor has posed to the teachers is: What do you do when there is violence? How do you stop it?

Everyone has condemned the entry of police into the campus from the opposite side. I have myself stated that I do not by any means feel happy when the police has to be called. But what does one do? If there is violence and intimidation, if there is a

small group of people and everyone has agreed that the bulk of students do not approve of violence....

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: That is one-sided version; the other side is also there. I can tell you that I did not meet anyone of party Members from the Opposition. But I met your party Members, a number of them, of the Metropolitan Council.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: The hon. Member must go deep into the problem. I could say quite a few things about his party. I am avoiding that. The people who owe allegiance to his party have not tried to distinguish it.

The question that arises is: Can a university function when there is the threat of violence and intimidation? My humble submission is, if there is the threat or violence and intimidation, no university can function. It has been said there is unemployment. Of course, there is unemployment. But on humanitarian grounds, are we going to take a view that if a person is not educated, then. If he is unemployed, no harm is done? But if a person is educated and he is unemployed, then Heavens have fallen!

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Who told you? We are equally concerned for both.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: We do not take that view. There are the masses. Please do not forget that only 3.2 per cent of the young people in the age group of 17—24 are in any institution of higher education. The bulk of our people are outside. Therefore, as representatives of people, we should be deeply concerned with the problem of unemployment in general. The problem of unemployment is something that should cause anxiety to every representative of the people and that is quite a correct attitude. But to say that because there is unemployment among the educated youth, the educated youth has the right to do things which the uneducated youth does not have the right to

do, is not a correct attitude. They do not cease to be our children if they are uneducated. We cannot apply a different yardstick to those who have not had the privilege of going to a university. Our hearts should melt equally for the young people in general whether they are in the universities or not.

Then, Sir, a justification has been given about non-involvement. There are a few problems which have arisen. The decision that has to be taken is: are we going to treat the students as children or are we going to treat them as grown-ups? This is a basic and fundamental decision. We cannot in the same breath ask that the students should be treated as grown-ups and given a voice in decision-making in the university bodies and at the same time say that it is, after all, the buoyancy of youth. This is an argument whose contradiction worries me a great deal.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Follow the traditional saying:

प्राप्ते तु बोद्धशे वं  
पुत्रं मित्रवदाचरैत् ।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: We did not prepare the UGC report. It is the erudite scholars who prepared it. They have dealt with student participation in an elaborate manner.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: Another point has been made by my very good friend, Mr. Sathe. He asked, if he is a voter, why can he not be on the decision-making body. I hope, my hon. friend is not suggesting that any one who qualifies to be a voter should be on the decision-making body of a university.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: That has not been well taken.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: The point is that I am a firm believer in the involvement of the student with the various decision-making processes

of the university. But I am wanting this not because it is going to relieve unrest—that is an unrelated problem. My hon. friend, Mr. Stephen, referred to Kerala University where students had been given representation in the various university bodies any other university had given it. And yet, going back to those figures of June to November, out of 1729 cases of student violence in the whole country, 109 took place in Kerala; in the order, it stands at number three, with Andhra Pradesh 915 Punjab 187 and Kerala 109. I agree with the conclusion which many hon. members have reached that it is worthwhile associating university students with the processes of decision-making. But all that I am submitting is that this is not going to solve the problems of the student's unrest. It is necessary as an academic process.

20 hrs.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: As a part of the process.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: ...and an educational process.

Some years ago, it was thought that in a university, the teacher teaches and the student learns. That theory has been completely given up. Now, it is considered to be a learning process where the teacher and the students both participate and there is a mutual give and take. Therefore, in view of this changed theory which is now universally accepted, it is necessary that the students should be involved in the process of decision-making and it is with this basic thinking that the Government have accepted and have recommended to the State Governments to accept the Gajendragadkar Committee's report which wants to involve the students at every stage with the decision making process.

I also agree with the point which many of my hon. friends have made

[Prof. S. Nurul Hasan]

that all unrest is not bad. I think a certain degree of unrest is essential if the community of students is to be alive. I think they are impatient. I hope that they do not like hypocrisy if they see it anywhere. I hope they have ideals which they wish to achieve. I hope that they are aspiring to make their country much better than what their elders have succeeded in making. All these things are welcome signs. We should not get worried about those things. We should try to produce a mechanism in which these aspirations, this unrest, this progressive unrest of the youth is able to channelise itself for the betterment of the society in general so that education really becomes an instrument of social transformation. I entirely agree with the point which several hon. Members have made that education must become an instrument of social transformation.

I have, on several occasions, claimed the indulgence of the House, to express my own dissatisfaction and that of my Government, with the existing system of higher education. I have used occasionally words which were stronger than what I should have used, particularly, in regard to the examination system. I even went so far as to say that though anyone else may have faith in this examination system, I have none. I know it from inside as my hon. friends here who know it from outside would bear me out. But, having lost faith in the examination system and having submitted that we are trying to do everything possible, to persuade the academic community to bring about radical changes in the examination system—only recently I have addressed letters...

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: In the teaching system.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: That is also equally important.

I am just giving one example. But, what is worrying is that though the demand is not that this examination

system is inadequate, that it is not a test of the competence, and that, under the present system, people who have not succeeded in developing their intellect, manage to pass or manage to get high marks, the agitation that starts in some cases is: lower the standard of evaluation, make the question papers easier, make the pass percentage lower and things of that sort.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Just give us the degree. That is what they want.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: If I may come back to figures—I do not wish to refer to these figures too frequently—there were 74 cases where this was the principal demand. This is a matter which requires very careful consideration. That the educational system deserves to be transformed so that it can contribute to the social transformation is an unexceptionable point with which I find myself, and my Government find itself, in total agreement. That it is necessary to change the examination system is another point with which we are in full agreement. That the change of the educational system would also involve making education more relevant, making education more creative, so that the energies of the youth can be properly harnessed and that they can be canalised for the welfare of society, is also a thing which I could very easily, readily and gladly concede, nevertheless most of the issues on which the unrest has expressed itself are issues which are far from those which my hon. friends have mentioned in this House.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Have a national seminar on all these issues; it will help.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: We have held several seminars. Several Commissions have already reported. Several meetings have been held. More meetings will be held, I can assure my hon. friend.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: More confusion will be there.



PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: The hon. Member knows the famous story. After the First World War, when Lloyd George was faced with this very difficult question 'Should he demand reparation from Germany' which was a very technical question, he appointed a Committee of five experts, who were all economists and Prof. Keynes was one of those, and he got six conflicting opinions. Therefore, it is one of the glories of the academic profession that every individual does independent thinking. But we cannot always accept this advice. We will have to take a realistic view. We will have to take the issue in its proper setting. We will have to look at the whole issue in proper setting. When I say proper setting, I would submit, there are two points to be taken into account.

Firstly, we must go ahead with the process of changing the educational system.

Secondly, we should not tolerate violence, intimidation and threat of violence on campuses.

Thank you. ✓

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House now stands adjourned to meet on Monday at 11 A.M.

20.08 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, December 18, 1972/Agrahayana 27, 1894 (Saka).