

REPORT OF THE
SEMINAR
ON
POSTGRADUATE TEACHING AND RESEARCH
IN
HISTORY

NIEPA DC



D06235

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION
NEW DELHI
1964

© UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION
NEW DELHI (INDIA)
1964



Rs. 2.20 ; Sh. 5/2 ; 80 cents

Printed by Hindustan Publishing Corporation at Hindustan Scientific Press
Published by the University Grants Commission in September, 1964.
Available with the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi

CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Foreword</i>	v
<i>Introduction</i>	vii
1. THE WORKING PAPER	1
2. COMMENTS ON THE WORKING PAPER	12
3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	22
(a) PROFESSOR H. BUTTERFIELD	22
(b) PROFESSOR ROBERT I. CRANE	24
(c) PROFESSOR HOLDEN FURBER	27
(d) PROFESSOR JOEL HURSTFIELD	28
(e) PROFESSOR R.C. MAJUMDAR	30
(f) PROFESSOR R. NAGAR	31
(g) PROFESSOR BURTEN STEIN	32
REPORTS	
4. OBJECTIVES	37
5. CURRICULUM	39
6. ASSESSMENT AND PRIOR TRAINING	42
7. RESEARCH	44
8. INTER-DISCIPLINARY APPROACH	47
9. TEACHERS' ROLE	48
10. RECOMMENDATIONS	51
APPENDICES	
A. PROGRAMME	59
B. WORK LOAD OF TEACHERS	60
C. STAFF-STUDENT RATIO	64
D. LST OF PARTICIPANTS	68

FOREWORD

A SEMINAR on teaching and research in history was organised by the University Grants Commission from 11th to 14th January, 1964. It was inaugurated by Dr. C.D. Deshmukh, Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University. The Seminar was attended by professors and scholars of history from our universities and other institutions concerned with historical research. We were also fortunate to have the participation of eminent historians from abroad who were in Delhi at the time to attend the XXVI International Congress of Orientalists. The Commission is grateful to all participants from India and abroad for their valuable contributions and suggestions for the improvement of teaching and research in the field of history.

The present volume contains the proceedings and some of the papers presented at the Seminar. I hope the publication would be of wide interest to teachers and scholars of history in the country.

I would like to take this opportunity to express our thanks to Shri P.N. Kirpal, Educational Adviser to the Government of India, and Chairman of the Steering Committee, for his keen interest and general guidance, to Dr. S. Bhattacharya, Deputy Secretary (Humanities) of the University Grants Commission, who spared no pains to organise the Seminar, and to Dr. T. Raychaudhuri, Dr. P.S. Gupta and Dr. (Miss) Romila Thapar of the University of Delhi and to Dr. R.D. Deshpande, Education Officer, University Grants Commission for their cooperation and assistance in the preparation of this volume.

D.S. KOTHARI

Chairman

University Grants Commission

New Delhi

24th September, 64.

INTRODUCTION

IN ORDER to examine the state of historical studies in India, particularly in the sphere of postgraduate teaching and research, the University Grants Commission decided to organise a seminar to have an intensive discussion on the existing methods of postgraduate teaching and research in history and to suggest measures for improvement. A steering committee of some scholars available in Delhi was appointed to advise the Commission on the organisation of the seminar. The committee consisted of the following :

- (i) Shri P. N. Kirpal —*Chairman*
Secretary to the Government of India
Ministry of Education
New Delhi
- (ii) Dr. Bisheshwar Prasad
Professor of History
University of Delhi
Delhi
- (iii) Dr. S. Gopal
Director Historical Division
Ministry of External Affairs
New Delhi
- (iv) Dr. T. Raychaudhuri
Delhi School of Economics
University of Delhi
Delhi
- (v) Dr. S. Bhattacharya
Dy. Secretary (Humanities)
University Grants Commission
New Delhi.

2. A working paper setting out the problems to be discussed was prepared by the committee and circulated to a large number of teachers of history in universities and colleges in India and also to some teachers of history in the universities of the Commonwealth and of the United States of America. Comments were invited on the

working paper and these were in turn circulated so that historians might be familiar with each other's views.

3. The seminar was held at the University Grants Commission building at New Delhi from January 11-14, 1964. Dr. C. D. Deshmukh, Vice-Chancellor, Delhi University inaugurated the seminar. Shri P.N. Kirpal introduced the subjects which required special consideration in the prevailing conditions of teaching and research in history in the universities in India.

4. The participants consisted of teachers of history and some allied subjects mostly from the universities in India. A few historians from foreign countries, who were in Delhi in connection with the XXVI International Congress of Orientalists and who are familiar with teaching and research in history in Indian universities, were also invited to participate in the seminar. The number of participants was kept deliberately small in order to ensure intensive discussion.

5. The main problems of teaching and research in history at postgraduate level were divided into following groups :

- i. Objectives
- ii. Content—curriculum
- iii. Content—assessment and prior training
- iv. Research
- v. Interdisciplinary approach
- vi. Teachers' role

Discussion centred round each of these topics in succession. The procedure adopted was that discussion on a topic was briefly initiated by one member and was then taken up by the seminar. A report on each discussion was prepared by the rapporteurs. At the final session the seminar, as a whole, made recommendations to the University Grants Commission, which, it was felt, would assist in the process of raising the standard of historical research and teaching in Indian universities.

6. The purpose of publishing the proceedings of the seminar is to acquaint teachers of history with the problems discussed at the seminar and the conclusions arrived at. The working paper which was the main document under discussion has been included here as also the summary of the comments on the working paper. A few additional comments which came from historians who were not present at the seminar but which, it was thought, would be of general interest have also been included. Reports on the discussions

and the final recommendations are also made available in this publication. Further, there is a brief appendix providing factual information on two problems which were frequently referred to during the discussion, viz. the work load of teachers and staff-student ratio.

7. In publishing these proceedings two inter-related facts were kept in view, viz., (a) to focus attention on the conditions of historical studies in our universities today and, (b) to elicit reaction of a nature which would assist the promoters in their attempt to raise the standard of the historical discipline in its academic context.

CHAPTER I

THE WORKING PAPER*

I. OBJECTIVES

SINCE ANY operational suggestion regarding the content or method of teaching and research will be necessarily determined by the objectives one has in view, the seminar may first seek to arrive at a broad measure of agreement on this point as the basis for discussion on other issues.

(a) *Possible objectives*: Postgraduate studies in history can perform at least three different functions in the context of our society, viz., (1) contribute to the general education and intellectual training of laymen in various walks of life who do not make any direct use of their knowledge of history in their day-to-day activities; (2) provide a basis for certain types of vocations like journalism and the work of foreign affairs specialists, besides teaching in schools and colleges; and (3) train scholars for advanced research in history. The emphasis on one or other of the several possible objectives of historical studies,—e.g. (1) factual knowledge combined with some analysis of historical processes as an introduction to the modern world, (2) an awareness and appreciation of the heritage of human civilization, (3) an intellectual training in techniques of analysis, testing of evidence and comprehension of the multiple facets of human evolution, (4) a sound training for creative research, etc.,—will be determined by the relative importance to be attached to each of the above functions. The training involved in the different functions or implied by the various objectives are not mutually exclusive. At the same time, any system of advanced historical studies can include them only in one of numerous possible combinations. Here is a question of weightage to be given to specific aspects to be determined in accordance with our understanding of the requirements.

* The purpose of this working paper is to spell out the issues to be discussed at the seminar. The tentative suggestions regarding specific questions are merely meant to stimulate discussion and should not be interpreted as directives.

(b) *Relevant considerations* : In deciding on objectives, we have to reckon with certain determining influences. (1) Quantitatively, postgraduate studies in history mainly cater to the needs of people who make little or no use of their historical knowledge in their day-to-day work. If this fact is to determine primarily our approach to the question of objectives, we will have to emphasize the informational and more general aspects of historical studies, as contrasted with a relatively rigorous training required for specialists. Such an emphasis may, however, be combined with a sound intellectual training required at the higher levels of all non-specialized vocations. Concretely, this would imply a syllabus with a fairly wide coverage and a bias in favour of recent history, history of India and a general knowledge of the seminal phases in world history ; reading lists of moderate length with an accent on up-to-date tertiary works ; a system of teaching primarily dependent on lectures and an examination system requiring a general rather than a very detailed knowledge of the subject. By and large, the pattern of advanced studies in history in India today conforms to the above picture. If we accept the objective implicit in the pattern as adequate, changes affecting only the details of the present system will be called for.

(2) The heavy demand for postgraduate education renders any strictness in the selection of students increasingly difficult. The degree of specialization or intensive study possible at the M.A. stage is naturally affected by this fact. The argument for strengthening the existing system rather than an altogether new orientation thus acquires an added force.

(3) A system of advanced studies in history oriented to general rather than specialized training generates certain problems: it affects the quality of training of future researchers, teachers and, generally, all those who will make a professional use of their knowledge of history or, simply, have an intellectual appetite for a relatively more detailed knowledge and deeper understanding of the historical processes. A general training in this field of study does not necessarily provide a basis for specialization through self-education. At best such self-education without a background of proper training, in the context of the immense development of historical studies, remains discouragingly difficult. The question of providing some optional means of specialization at the M.A. stage or an additional period of training oriented to the same need thus arises.

(c) *The questions at issue* : The above considerations suggest certain broad questions to be decided as the basis for further discussion on the content of and approach to historical studies in our universities.

(i) Whether the emphasis at the M.A. stage should be on (a) specialization implying intensive knowledge, both in content and in method, or (b) on a sound general knowledge of history.

(ii) Should our approach be (a) primarily academic and humanistic, underlining such seminal phases and aspects of history as have been very thoroughly studied and thus provide a sound basis for academic-intellectual training ; or (b) emphasize the 'utilitarian' aspect of history, *i.e.*, concentrate on such phases of history as provide an introduction to the modern world, even where there is not yet any adequate historical literature on the subject (*e.g.*, recent history of South East Asia). Even if the above two alternatives are to be combined, the question of relative weightage needs to be decided. A choice, implicit in this question, is whether our emphasis should be determined by the relative importance of various factors in world history today (and the desire to know their background), or an objective assessment of what was important in past historical epochs, even if its identifiable consequences are relatively less marked today. To wit, if it were a question of choice between the history of the European Renaissance and the U.S.A. in the 19th century, what should we choose ? This pattern of choice is relevant to research as much as to the pre-research levels of higher education in history.

(iii) If we decide in favour of a general rather than specialized approach to the pre-research levels of study, whether some optional or additional provision for intensive training is not required.

II. CONTENT OF POSTGRADUATE TEACHING IN HISTORY

(a) *The curriculum*

The existing M.A. syllabi may be examined and the required direction of change, if any, may be suggested in accordance with the objectives agreed on :

(1) *The specific fields of study* covered in the M.A. syllabi may be surveyed to determine whether the following aspects or phases of history and historical studies need greater or less emphasis than at present :

(i) Certain seminal phases and aspects of history which have

been studied and provide a sound basis for academic discipline. *e.g.*, Europe since the renaissance, history of Greece and Rome, history of the U.S.A. In considering this aspect, the fact that the history of some areas and phases have been more thoroughly studied than of others and thus provide a relatively sounder basis for academic and intellectual training may be taken into account. The question as to whether we should select limited fields for intensive study or prefer a wider coverage may also be discussed.

(ii) The great civilizations, *e.g.*, the Ancient and Near East, China, etc. If a general, rather than specialized approach is preferred, the need for an acquaintance with such epochs of human evolution and the question whether such areas of study should not preferably be covered at an earlier stage may be considered.

(iii) *History of India* : The maximum emphasis in most of our syllabi is on this field and the tendency generally is towards a period-wise specialization, proceeding from a more general coverage earlier. Some of the questions to be considered are (a) whether at this stage, too, the pattern of period-wise specialization should be somewhat altered to emphasize the fact of continuity and a greater awareness of problems which stretch over different periods; (b) whether a more thorough study of certain aspects, *e.g.*, cultural history and history of religious movements is necessary, (c) whether the curriculum should include certain aspects for special study on which the available literature is very meagre. This last question may be considered particularly with reference to social history.

(iv) *Types of historical writing* : A course on this theme, compulsory at many American universities, based on the study of selected standard historical works could be useful for both the specialist and the non-specialist.

(v) *Recent history in general and of particular areas* : Whether the history of areas on which the available historical literature is now inadequate should also be studied.

(vi) *Study of source-material* : While the study of source material is included in most curriculae, the question whether a greater degree of emphasis in the form of compulsory questions on sources at the examination or even a full paper, compulsory or optional, should not be introduced, may be discussed.

(vii) *Relevant languages* : Whether the study of documents in the original languages may not be optionally included in the curriculum as has been done in Ceylon.

In considering the above details, two general problems may be

kept in view. (1) The question of adjusting the claims of various fields of study in a particular syllabus, e.g., the relative weightage to be given to Indian and non-Indian history and whether we should, resources permitting, allow a very wide choice of courses, the number of compulsory papers being limited to a minimum; (2) if the conflicting claims of a general and a specialized course should be solved by bifurcating the syllabus at the M.A. stage and including an optional specialized curriculum.

(2) *Recommended reading* : The following questions may be considered :

(i) Whether the compulsory workload indicated by the prescribed reading list on the basis of which the students are examined should be heavier than at present.

(ii) If there should be a greater emphasis on up-to-date monographs, in preference to tertiary works, than at present, particularly in connection with non-Indian history.

(iii) Should the students be compulsorily required to consult some standard historical journals, a select list of articles being included in the prescribed reading list.

(iv) If the compulsory work load is maintained at a moderate level, should the syllabi include additional recommended reading, including lists of articles, for such students as may be interested.

(b) *Assessment*

(i) The nature of assessment of the student's work will also depend on the degree of specialization aimed at. If a detailed knowledge of at least some part of the prescribed course is aimed at, the examination questions may also focus attention on details. In such a case, much larger number of alternatives than is usually provided in our question papers would be required.

(ii) The question as to how far in our examinations an attempt is made to examine the student's capacity to think for himself rather than his knowledge of facts and opinions embodied in tertiary works, may be discussed. If, in view of the material limitations, there are difficulties about raising the general standard, the possibility of including optional questions of a critical nature in the question papers and awarding a relatively higher rating to those who will tackle these adequately, may be considered.

(iii) Specific questions on source material on a compulsory or optional basis (see "Curriculum, (1) (vi) above).

(iv) On the basis of decisions regarding (ii) and (iii), we may consider whether, a system of “*starred first*” or “*summa cum laude*” should be introduced to encourage the more capable students to undertake more detailed and critical study (to be tested through optional starred questions in the examination papers).

(c) *Question of prior training*

Since the standard of teaching is largely determined by the quality and receptivity of students, the question as to whether an adequate knowledge of history should be made a pre-condition of admission to the M.A. classes may be discussed. The following specific questions may be tackled in this connection :

(i) Whether an honours or at least a pass degree in history and a certain level of performance in terms of percentage of marks secured should be insisted on ;

(ii) In case some optional provision for a higher level of specialization in the curriculum is intended, whether the prior training required of those opting for this course should not be different from that required of students opting for the general course.

III. RESEARCH

(a) *Question of prior training*

(1) So long as the orientation of the syllabus, teaching and assessment at the M.A. stage is general rather than specialized, it is necessary to enquire if a student intending to undertake research should not be first made to go through a period of intensive training in (i) selected fields of historical studies, both Indian and non-Indian, (ii) research methods, (iii) relevant languages, etc. ; and whether the same necessity persists even if a relatively specialized course is provided for at the M.A. stage ;

(2) Whether the provision for such additional training should be institutionalized either (i) as a part requirement for Ph. D. course or (ii) as a separate course leading to a post M.A. degree ;

(3) If a separate course is preferred whether anyone desiring an advanced training in history, not necessarily as a preparation for a doctoral dissertation, should not be allowed or encouraged to take it up.

(b) *Organization of instruction for the research courses*

(1) Choice of subjects for research : These subjects approved in recent years may be examined to see if (i) they are such as are likely to provide an insight into historical processes rather than involve a superficial summerization of data, (ii) they are manageable in terms of the period or source material sought to be covered ; (iii) there is adequate source material. The question of devising some means of concentrating attention on significant areas and pooling information on research in progress, so as to avoid duplication, may be discussed.

(2) Often, as a result of the growing demand for admission to Ph. D. courses, university teachers are forced to undertake supervision of research in fields with which they are not sufficiently familiar. We may enquire if this problem can be tackled by (i) encouraging students to undertake research in fields where adequate supervision is locally available and (ii) co-operation between the universities enabling students to work under the supervision of a guide teaching in a different university.

(3) Possible ways of institutionalizing instruction at the research level.

(i) Provision for regularity of supervision, the student being required to have discussions with his supervisor a prescribed number of times per term.

(ii) Research classes, also to be held a prescribed number of times, where the researchers will read papers relating to their general field of study, *e.g.*, 19th century Indian and non-Indian history if he is working on a 19th century problem.

(iii) Research seminars consisting of researchers working in allied fields where research papers and specific problems connected with the work in progress will be discussed.

(iv) Refresher courses and summer schools to keep the researchers in touch with the advance in knowledge and technique in various fields of study. Anyone professionally interested in history may be encouraged to participate in such courses so that, through exchange of ideas, any tendency towards narrow specialization may be tempered; and, on the other hand, a wider audience for historical studies may be kept in touch with the work of the specialists.

(v) Possible ways of pooling the resources of the Indian universities so that research material, expertise, etc., available in any Indian university may be accessible to all others.

IV. INTER-DISCIPLINARY APPROACH

The relevance of a large number of disciplines, including sociology, economics, political science, anthropology, statistical method, linguistics, etc., to the study of history is being increasingly appreciated. The following are some of the possible ways whereby the impact of relevant disciplines may be brought to bear on historical studies in India :

(1) Students intending to take up postgraduate studies in history may be encouraged to opt for certain specified subsidiary subjects at the undergraduate stage.

(2) Optional or additional courses relating to relevant disciplines may be included in the M.A. curriculum for history.

(3) Even if courses relating to other disciplines are not included in the curriculum, courses of lectures emphasizing such aspects of other disciplines as are most relevant to historical studies may be organized to be supplemented by seminar work which will test and deepen the student's understanding of these allied fields.

(4) At the post M.A. level: at the preparatory stage of research and—as a part of any other course leading to a degree, other than a doctorate instruction in the other relevant disciplines may be organized on a more regular basis. For instance, a researcher in economic history may be required to attend some courses in economics, and one in social history courses in sociology and anthropology.

(5) Researchers working on subjects involving more than one discipline may work under more than one supervisor representing the relevant disciplines.

(6) To emphasize the inter-disciplinary approach at the teacher's level, discussion on specific problems in which scholars from different disciplines will participate, may be organized in the individual universities as also on an inter-university basis.

(7) Research projects involving more than one discipline may be undertaken by historians in collaboration with economists, sociologists, anthropologists, etc.

V. ROLE OF THE TEACHER

(a) *Class lectures*

So long as the student-teacher ratio* remains as unfavourable as

* Detailed information on the question of the staff-student ratio is included in the appendix.

at present, the class lecture will necessarily remain the pivot of the system of instruction. We may consider if within these limitations certain improvements are possible :

(1) Unlike certain subjects, such as philosophy or mathematics, the degree of abstraction involved in historical studies is relatively less demanding. In the subjects involving more abstraction the teacher, in the absence of adequate facilities for tutorial work, is forced to cover the whole course in detail in the class lectures so that the average student does not miss through incomprehension any link in the chain of arguments. A teacher of history is not under the same compulsion to provide through his lectures a full summary of facts relevant to a particular course. In fact, given a limited number of lecture hours, he can do so only at the risk of superficiality.

Hence the possibility of covering a selected, but not a small number of topics in considerable depth through lectures, as an indication of the manner in which the subject should be approached and studied, and requiring the student, through seminar work, to cover the rest of the course himself with the aid of reading lists and under the teacher's guidance may be considered. Such a system would combine the advantages of intensive instruction and training the student to think for himself.

(2) While the lecturer must attune his standards to a realistic appraisal of the student's background and capacities, he also must cater to the requirements of the abler and more enthusiastic. He may encourage the habit of critical and extensive reading by providing adequate bibliographical information, though the lectures may have to be based on a relatively narrower range of literature. The question as to whether the system of lectures based primarily on one or two tertiary works should be abandoned also needs to be discussed.

(b) *Seminars, preceptorials and tutorials*

In a large number of our universities, the number of teachers available is not adequate for tackling this work efficiently. So long as this problem is not solved, seminars involving relatively larger groups (where not only papers will be read, but the teacher will induce all members to participate by putting questions on the basis of recommended reading) may be more effective than tutorials. If the lecture system is reoriented on the lines indicated above, there

will be a greater inducement to participate in seminar work effectively. Tutorials and preceptorials, based on very small groups, should perhaps be introduced only as and when an adequate number of qualified teachers is made available.

(c) *Teachers' work load and other requirements**

(1) The teacher's work load, if it is to be consistent with a fair level of efficiency, must be based on certain considerations.

(i) In view of the fast development in the various fields of historical studies, the teacher can be expected to cope with only a very limited number of subjects, consistently with the requirements of a reasonably high standard of teaching. The standard will necessarily suffer if he is required to lecture on too many subjects.

(ii) Even if the orientation of the M.A. syllabi remains general rather than specialized, the teacher who lectures on a particular field must have an intensive knowledge of it, even if he may not have made any independent contribution in that area of historical study. From this point of view, the problem of organizing instruction on non-Indian history is particularly acute, as the scope for intensive training in this field is very limited in India. The question of staff requirements and facilities for intensive training in such fields may be discussed.

(iii) Particularly in the early stages of teaching at the post-graduate level, the teacher requires the necessary facilities for deepening his knowledge of the subject. Such facilities may be provided through adjusting the work-load suitably, group discussions (see below), adequate supply of library material, etc. The magnitude of the work load and the research output demanded of the new entrants to the profession may be reviewed in this context.

(iv) The last point raises the question as to whether the quantity of research output commonly expected of the university teacher today does not lead to a certain disproportion, *i.e.*, affect the possibility of his keeping up with developments in the subject as a whole and thus the quality of this teaching and eventually of his research itself.

(2) Library facilities for study and research need to be examined. The accessibility of new material may perhaps be improved if there is a regular system of circulating the standard journals among

* Detailed information on this subject is included in the Appendix.

the members of the staff, and a regular supply of lists of fresh acquisitions as also of classified lists of articles appearing in the recently acquired issues of journals.

(3) A regular exchange of ideas and information among specialists in various fields of history may be ensured through teachers' discussion groups or seminars organized as a normal part of the academic routine. In such teachers' seminars, the members of the staff may, *inter alia*, present critical statements about the developments in specific fields of study along with adequate bibliographical notes.

(4) Visiting professors may be requested to organize discussion groups to cover specific fields. While such groups will be necessarily located in particular universities, facilities may be provided to teachers from other universities to take part in these. The exchange of teachers may be extended to the inter-university level and not kept confined to the international level only.

(5) Facilities available under the existing schemes (*e.g.*, some of the UNESCO projects) may be utilised in a planned manner so that our history teachers may acquire a first hand knowledge of the content and manner of advanced teaching in history in other parts of the world.

CONCLUSION

The points raised above do not, of course, cover the whole range of problems connected with the subject of our discussion. They, however, are meant to provide some foci for discussion. The comments may, therefore, be confined, by and large, to the broad issues raised, though any suggestions regarding addition or omission of details will be welcome.

CHAPTER 2

COMMENTS ON THE WORKING PAPER

SYNOPSIS

The synopsis attempts to indicate only the main points raised in the various comments. It is meant to be an aid to discussions and not an exhaustive summary of all the papers.

OBJECTIVES

THE CONSENSUS of opinion on the objectives of postgraduate studies in history in Indian universities is strongly in favour of specialization. The claims of specialization and a relatively general approach, it has been pointed out, can and should be reconciled, but not at the cost of diluting standards. Those who expect a general intellectual training from their M.A. history course, but will not make any professional use of their historical knowledge, will also profit most from a relatively rigorous discipline. On the other hand, any dilution of standards at this stage will adversely affect the quality of historical studies in India. A further relevant consideration is the increasing proportion of future school teachers among the students in the postgraduate history classes. Such students will professionally use their knowledge of history and hence should be adequately equipped. The requirements of a more general approach should be met at the B.A. honours level. Several contributors have deplored the tendency to treat the M.A. course as a continuation of the honours course involving no higher degree of specialization. Further, there is a unanimous demand that in admitting students to the M.A. classes, strict standards of suitability should be observed and all non-academic considerations ignored. Otherwise attempts to improve standards will be useless.

Some contributors have suggested that until we have an adequate number of specialists, the majority of universities can aim at offering only a relatively general training of high standard. Cadres of university teachers will have to be built up in a planned way to

meet the requirements of genuinely specialized training in all our universities. Meanwhile, existing departments may be strengthened and, for the present, a few may be selected for concentration of resources in men and money. The latter should immediately provide the type of specialized rigorous training suggested in the comments, each centre being provided with an adequate number of specialists competent to teach and organize research on selected areas of *Indian and non-Indian* history on a high level. In order to economise on resources, duplication of centres in the same field, particularly of non-Indian history should be kept to a minimum, at least initially.

CONTENT OF POSTGRADUATE TEACHING IN HISTORY

In tune with the emphasis on specialization, the majority of the contributors have recommended that at the M.A. stage limited fields should be selected for intensive study and wider fields such as the study of great civilizations covered at an earlier stage. The suggestion that the syllabus should be bifurcated providing an alternative "Hard" course for specialists, has found no supporters.

The following are some of the important points raised in connection with the contents of the syllabus :

There should be a fair balance between Indian and 'non-Indian' history. Those who have recommended a special emphasis on Indian history, have suggested several alternative approaches to the study of the history of other regions. According to one view the contemporary history of Asia and Europe should be studied mainly as background for particular phases of Indian history, *e.g.*, the history of central Asia should be studied in connection with the Mughal period. A second view suggests a less direct link between the two parts of the syllabus and recommends the study of non-Indian history "to create a sense of perspective". A third view suggests that special periods of Indian history should be 'correlated' with comparable and relevant periods of non-Indian history on which substantial work has been done and which, therefore, provide a good discipline. For example, papers on ancient India should be offered along with papers on ancient China and the ancient Near East, and likewise 19th and 20th century India be studied along with segments of European, British or American history since the close of the 18th century.

The need for concentrating on the seminal phases and aspects

of history has been emphasized by one eminent historian as follows : “...A historical subject gains tremendously in depth when the minds of a succession of great historians have developed the study and brought out the implications of a theme during a considerable period of study. I have also felt sometimes that it takes about forty years to establish a really impressive teaching tradition in a new historical field. I think that if advanced students have been compelled to study a big theme in a really scholarly way, and in depth, this will alter the kind of mentality that they will bring to their work if, at the next stage, they move to a more ‘utilitarian’, more contemporary field”.

The same scholar has recommended the inclusion of a course on the history of historiography which has proved “an attractive and successful subject” at Cambridge, especially as it brought the students into the realm of general historical ideas as also into touch with problems connected with the philosophy of history. One commentator recommends that this course may be offered as an alternative to a paper on the history of political thought. Others felt that both international law and history of political thought should be compulsorily included in the M.A. history syllabus. According to one commentator, the syllabus should include two papers outside of history—one in another discipline, *e.g.* economics or sociology and the other in a field related to history, *e.g.*, Modern Indian Literature to complement the work in Modern Indian History. He suggests that five papers in history—three general, one in depth and the fifth in research—would be adequate.

There is some difference of opinion as to the advisability of including recent history, particularly of newly emerging Asian and African nations. While some have suggested that a knowledge of these fields is essential for an Indian student of history, others feel that such areas and even recent history in general provide an inadequate basis for academic discipline. One commentator suggests that such fields—including all areas on which the available literature is inadequate—should be taken up only at the post M.A. stage for purposes of research. Another scholar has suggested that courses in these fields should be included *optionally* in the syllabus.

The need for intensive study of certain specific fields as parts of the compulsory work load has been emphasized in several contributions. According to one, in view of our long connection with Great Britain and the availability of a vast literature on the subject, particular phases of British history should be intensively studied at the

M.A. stage. For similar reasons a study in depth of selected areas of European history in general has been recommended by others.

The teaching of Ancient Indian History raises some special problems to which the working paper has not drawn attention, according to some.

The M.A. syllabuses of various universities in Ancient Indian History are composite in nature covering political history, study of sources such as epigraphy and numismatics as also social, economic, religious and art history with optional papers on historical geography, cultural anthropology, etc. One historian suggests that the syllabus should include (i) contemporary ancient civilizations and (ii) historiography and methodology (including sociology of knowledge) in order to assist the present day efforts to interpret and reconstruct. The qualifying subjects for admission "should be History and/or Ancient Indian History and Culture, Sanskrit (or Pali), Sociology, Anthropology... ; one of these as major and any two as subsidiaries."

There is unanimous agreement on the need for the study of source material at the M.A. stage. A few have suggested the inclusion of a full or half-paper exclusively dealing with selected source materials. Others are in favour of teaching selected areas with detailed reference to source material. One commentator points out that in including source material in the syllabus, one must be clear about the purpose it is intended to serve. Collections of sources such as Butterfield's *Select Documents on European History* only offer an illustrative sample of the raw material of history. But if the student is to be trained to evaluate different types of evidence, the collection should be sufficiently varied in nature and focussed concentratedly on a manageable period and problem on which there is a minimum level of agreement. Without this agreement it would not be possible to select the types of sources necessary to show how historians arrive at certain conclusions despite the mutually contradictory evidence of source materials.

There is general agreement regarding the need for the study of relevant languages and of source material in the original languages. The majority of commentators, however, seem to feel that this necessary training should be taken up at the post M.A. stage or, at best, included optionally in the M.A. syllabus. Some have suggested that training in two languages—one in which the bulk of the source material is written and the second a European language such as French or German, rich in historical literature—should be made available to every postgraduate student of history.

Finally, a tendency noticed in some places to shape the syllabus according to the requirements of the Central Services examinations, has been deplored in strong terms. The courses should be based, it is felt, on academic values only and the Union Public Service Commission, if necessary, requested to follow the lead of the universities.

RECOMMENDED READING

It was pointed out that students of Indian history showed a tendency to repeat lectures almost verbatim in examination answers. They should be encouraged to argue with an open mind, to think consistently with logical method, and form their own independent opinion about the nature and trend of the facts they gathered. Indian students were often encouraged to depend on text books. Several commentators criticized this and desired that more stress should be given to the study of monographs and printed documentary material. One scholar, however, thought that while this should be encouraged, the study of "tertiary works" of recognized merit should continue to be the basis of work. Another historian thought that tertiary works in this context often meant shoddy texts based on copying a few earlier and perhaps equally shoddy texts; these should be destroyed and if a history department could not operate on a higher level, it might be advisable to close it down until it can.

It was generally felt that adequate reading lists should be prepared for the use of students. These should include lists of monographs and articles relevant to the subject. One scholar suggested that it should be mimeographed and not generally published: another noted that the prescribed materials in a syllabus should not be confused with exhaustive bibliographies, each of which was complementary to the other. The University Grants Commission should sponsor detailed bibliographies on different historical topics and phases on the model of the Harvard Guide to American History. But heavy lists for compulsory reading generally frightens ordinary students away from reading even the necessary works—heavy lists may mean less work. Separate bibliographies would give students freedom in choosing their data and interpretations.

Many commentators emphasized that there was a dearth of books compared to the excessive number of students in the classes. The ways in which this inequitable ratio could be mended were (a) the creation of departmental history libraries in which several

copies of a book could be kept, (b) the reprint at a cheap price of essential or rare monographs, (c) mimeographs or typing several copies of essential articles for use in department libraries, reproduction and collection of essential groups of source material. All these should be done at a low cost to benefit the general students rather than only a select few.

Assessment

It has been pointed out that the general run of questions in examinations were exceedingly stereotyped and therefore conformed to ideas of history which had long become obsolete. A more intelligent approach to framing questions had to be evolved.

Several commentators emphasized that questions should elicit critical and analytical answers. They should be set on the interpretation of what in Oxford was known as "gobbets" of source-material, or the answers at least, should show knowledge of the sources.

It was suggested that within the same examination, some questions should be more weighted for gaining marks than the others. This could be done either by giving say 40 or 35 marks to one question out of five optional ones, and say 20 to the rest, or by setting comparatively difficult ones to be able to spot the perceptive examinee, and some easier ones for the common students.

One scholar thought that awarding a "starred" first was like distinguishing between the airconditioned first class and ordinary first class in the Railways. A first class should remain a superlative degree. On the other hand, others felt that in present circumstances in India, the upgrading of postgraduate students should not cause us to penalize the good and hard working students who deserve a First; but they should be differentiated from the really good by some system like "starring". The difficulty in differentiating between educated second class M.A.s and less educated second class M.A.s now that the third class is being abolished was pointed out.

It was believed that *viva voce* examinations should be organized to check on knowledge and that they were no more difficult to organize than in western countries. But it was also felt that all these reforms were antecedent to an improvement in teaching standards and to the creation of a cadre of trained teachers. There was one suggestion that grading instead of numerical marking should be introduced.

The question of prior training

There was general agreement that honours students were the best possible candidates to be admitted to postgraduate courses. Many commentators wanted the minimum pre-requisite to be honours degree or 50% marks in the history pass course, but some argued that admission should be open only to honours and not to pass students, in order to avoid quality of levels of knowledge within the same class and consequent lowering of standards.

There was difference of opinion on the need for training in history, prior to admission in the M.A. classes. A few commentators felt that good students from other disciplines should not be precluded from entering the M.A. course and that this would not harm standards at all.

III. RESEARCH

(a) Question of prior training

Several commentators have pointed out that a major reason for the poor quality of research is that it attracts, by and large, only very mediocre talents, the better students preferring more lucrative opportunities. The students to be admitted to the research courses should, hence, be selected very carefully. Besides, no supervisor should guide more than a reasonable number of researchers. Some have expressed concern over the fact that the poor quality of Ph.D. theses on Indian history is not confined to Indian universities. Theses in this field approved by reputed foreign universities also are often no better than intellectual hack work.

As to the question of some advanced training as preparation for research, some feel that this would be unnecessary if the M.A. course provided an adequately specialized training. Others have recommended a further period of "advance teaching for those who wish to specialize in history with a view to research, though not yet qualified to embark on major research without further training or testing of capacity. This should be for intending teachers (school or university); should be more specialized; and should offer the opportunity for individual research under close supervision and the production of some form of thesis." Such further training has been recommended by some as a part of the doctoral course, others would prefer to have it organized as a separate degree course. The

need for initial training, according to one commentator, can be met by a probationary period during which the student's capacity for research may be tested. One commentator observes that the standard of research degrees should not be lowered and the system of intermediate level research degrees has encouraged a crop of very inferior research which should be strongly discouraged.

(b) Organization of training for the research courses

As to the suggestions contained in the working paper for organizing instruction at the research level, the majority of the commentators have approved of these, while some are opposed to the idea of strait-jacketing research. All agree that research guides should not undertake supervision in areas of which they have no specialized knowledge. Some have suggested that students working in particular fields should be encouraged to go to such centres as can offer adequate guidance and facilities for research in that area.

Opinions differ as regards the acceptability of the specific suggestions about the organization of research guidance. Many have agreed that there should be clearly stated rules about regularity of supervision,—a fixed number of times per month or per term. Others would prefer more flexible arrangements. Some have found the suggestions concerning both 'research classes' and research seminars very acceptable. Others have expressed a preference for one of the two methods, but advised against the adoption of both.

Several suggestions have been put forward regarding exchange of information and collection of source material. Research bulletins or journals—sponsored by the University Grants Commission on an all-India basis or published by several universities in the same region jointly or by individual institutions—have been suggested. Such bulletins or journals would be regular channels for information regarding research in progress and all other relevant material. Mimeographed copies of unpublished theses should be secured by all the university libraries. One commentator suggests that the State archives or university libraries should also build up micro-film libraries of rare publications and important unpublished source material.

IV. INTER-DISCIPLINARY APPROACH

Nearly every commentator has emphasized the need to provide the historian "with good and relevant training in other social

sciences". Some of the means suggested in the working paper for providing this training have been generally approved. These include the requirement that students intending to take up postgraduate studies in history opt for certain specified subsidiary subjects at the undergraduate stage, inclusion of optional courses in social sciences in the M.A. history syllabus and courses of lectures on such subjects for students of history at the M.A. or the post M.A. stage. The idea of regular inter-disciplinary seminars at the teacher's level in individual institutions has also found general acceptance. Several commentators have, however, objected to the system of joint supervisors representing more than one discipline for an individual research student and suggested that the need for additional guidance should be met more informally.

V. THE TEACHER'S ROLE

An important point which emerges from the comments on the question of the teacher's role is that the problems are by no means uniform in character throughout India. For a large number of institutions—particularly the newly established universities—the student-teacher ratio is not a problem. Teachers in such institutions feel that their teaching need not consist primarily of lectures and an effective system of tutorials and seminars can be organized. But in these institutions as well as in the ones where the student teacher ratio is unfavourable, the range of specialization covered by the members of the faculty is often inadequate, particularly for instruction in the history of regions outside India. Another common problem is the unfavourable "student-book ratio". This is a major reason why students depend excessively on a few text books and lecture notes.

A commentator has thus described the present system of teaching: "Teachers usually dictate notes and recommend books of the nature of text books. At times details which are given are of a tedious type and do not interest students. Source books and books of advanced type are usually ignored by students. Seminars and tutorials...do not form part of the general scheme of teaching in many universities. Entire attention is concentrated on lectures. Even in universities where the seminar system prevails, it is not effective. Teaching in seminars and tutorials results in supplementary lecturing. There is hardly any discussion between students and teachers on controversial aspects of the subject."

The measures suggested in the working paper for the improvement of teaching standards have been commended generally. Several additional points have also been made in this connection. One commentator observes that at least the "special papers", meant to be studied intensively, should be taught by specialists in the relevant fields. The difficulty of attaining high standards in "non-Indian" history has been emphasized, as well as the great need for increased effort in this direction. The main reason for our weakness in this field, it has been pointed out, is that it has attracted very few able and properly equipped teachers. Two interrelated measures for dealing with this problem have been suggested. The first is to utilize the existing exchange and scholarship schemes to get an adequate number of teachers thoroughly trained in various fields of "non-Indian" history. This will necessarily involve sending academics abroad to do first degree courses as well and not exclusively for advanced research. Besides, the existing facilities may have to be supplemented by the government. Secondly, a number of senior posts should be ear-marked for specialists in these fields and the latter should be given at least moderate facilities for continuing research in their areas of specialization.

Several commentators have made the point that the present emphasis on research output as the basis for academic promotion should at least be partially modified so that up-to-date knowledge and understanding of the subject is treated at par with research. One commentator has suggested that the teacher fresh from the university should be encouraged to study widely and intensively rather than to launch on a limited research project straightaway. As to the teacher's work load, the consensus of opinion is against allotting more than two courses,—related to his or her field of specialization,—to each teacher.

While it is generally agreed that teaching at the M.A. stage should aim at far greater depth than is at present usual in our universities, one particular aspect of the problem has been underlined by several commentators. The tradition of learning by rote and making little use of one's own judgment is strengthened by the authoritarian tendencies of our educational system. In a proper atmosphere of intellectual training, these tendencies should be resisted. In the seminars and tutorials the students should be encouraged to express themselves freely and to criticize the teacher's views whenever necessary.

CHAPTER 3

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

(a) *Professor H. Butterfield, Chairman, Faculty Board of History,
University of Cambridge*

I THINK it is an excellent thing to have an M.A. system on the lines (and for the purposes) outlined on page 1 and 2 of the working paper; and, though it is much more difficult to achieve with our organization, I hope that by means of what we call our "Certificate" we may be producing something of the same sort here. I think it would be of the greatest importance (and it would raise the status of the whole programme page 6 you could secure that a good standard (and if possible an honours standard) had been achieved in history in the first degree while allowing a loophole for very exceptional people (e.g. a very able student of Russian who might have been seized with the desire to work on Russian history or an able member of the civil service who wished to move into academic life as an historian).

I have always thought that a course of study for M.A. degree might well be both general in one sense and specialized in another sense. If it were in Cambridge, for example, I would take the line that certain topics cannot be adequately dealt with in a general undergraduate course but could become admirable *general* studies in an M.A. course—indeed they would be admirable in themselves for students who went no further than the M.A., but they would also be indispensable for students proceeding to research in those fields. In Cambridge the subjects would include (in my view) (i) the History of the British Commonwealth, (ii) Modern Diplomatic History and International Relations, (iii) The History of Science. But they would be *made to fit the available lecturers* and they would tend to channel into those particular fields, the candidates who intended to go forward to Ph.D. work.

I do not know whether in undergraduate work or in M.A. work you are familiar with our system of special subjects (e.g. The French Revolution 1848) studied in detail with the help of collections of

printed sources. This is the accepted way here of getting students to grips with the problem of sources in a very limited area. I suppose that, if the microscope has once been applied to a totally different insight into the character of the historical process anywhere, and a better understanding of the basis of historical scholarship.

I have wondered about the wisdom of having amongst the subjects for M.A. work a course on "The Criticism of Historical Sources" (or simply on "Historical Method") and also, a substantially different thing, "The History of Historiography (or of Historical Scholarship). The former is capable of being a good *teaching* course (discussing various types of source, and various kinds of criticism appropriate to each), but it is not certain that it will prove a good *examination* subject (at least without the addition of the oral to the written examination.) The latter has proved an attractive and successful subject for the best of our undergraduates in their final year, especially as it brought them into the realm of general historical ideas and also brought them into touch with problems connected with the philosophy of history. British historians prefer concreteness rather than abstraction and the philosophy of history has never been successful here as an academic subject; but the history of historiography has sometimes had a remarkable effect on the intelligent modern student here, because while being a pretty concrete subject, it just opens out windows into the philosophy of history. I think it possible that all this may be still more significant for Indian students than for British students. Furthermore, though courses on historical criticism or on the history of history might seem to have a special relevance for those who intend to proceed to research and to a professional historical career. I think they may have great interest and importance for those who, after taking the M.A., intend to be teachers, journalists, civil servants, diplomats, etc.

I find myself particularly interested in some of the questions of teaching and examination method which are raised in the paper. The reference on page 3 (c) (ii) to "such seminal phases and aspects of history as have been very thoroughly studied and thus provide a sound basis for academic intellectual training" chimes in with my own deepest views about an historical curriculum and I am interested to see it in the present paper, as I have not found it easy to persuade my colleagues in this country to give their attention to the matter or to realize its importance. I believe that an historical subject gains tremendously in depth when the minds of a succession of great historians have developed the study and brought out the implications of a

theme during a considerable period of study. I have also felt sometimes that it takes about forty years to establish a really impressive teaching tradition in a new historical field. I think that if advanced students have been compelled to study a big theme in a really scholarly way, and in depth, this will alter the kind of mentality that they will bring to their work if, at the next stage, they move to a more 'utilitarian' more contemporary field. In fact they will be just that much less the prisoners of contemporary prejudices—less the prisoners also of the centemporary attitude of their world to that particular field of events.

In regard to paras (i) to (iv) of (2) at page 5, I think that it is possible to exaggerate the educational importance of articles in learned journals, which are often produced under technical restrictions. Great monographs may be very important at times, because they tend to involve many ideas as well as contributions from new sources. I agree with para iv in this section of page 5.

I regard page 5. (b) (i) as very important. The more one is interested in intellectual quality (rather than the accurate reproduction of memory work) the more important it becomes to have a wide range of options in the question paper; and this, in fact, allows one to make the questions themselves more of an intellectual test. It has been the tradition in the Modern European History Paper in the final year at Cambridge to set something like 24 questions of which only 4 need be attempted. Even if there are for the time being some inescapable limitations which prevent the adoption of this policy, I should wish to support very strongly the suggestion (b) (ii) at page 5, of the paper.

May I also stress my particularly strong support for the proposal page 7 (3) (i) and (ii)

I also regard page 9 (1) as of very great importance and wish that its significance were better realized in our teaching systems in England.

(b) *Professor Robert I. Crane, Department of History, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina*

Before making these comments I might remark that I had the good fortune to lecture to the sixth year M.A. class at one of your universities for several months last year, and was able thereby to get some insight into the problems raised in your stimulating

memorandum. Also, at home I tend to teach more graduate students than undergraduates.

Your memorandum points to the general education of laymen as a possible objective of postgraduate studies in history. There is, of course, such a function for M.A. and later studies, but my remarks will have little to say about that objective. The serious business of postgraduate studies is not the general education of laymen. Nor, in my judgement, can the incidental education of laymen be allowed to dictate the aims or content of postgraduate studies in history for general education. The B.A. degree is available for the general education of laymen. If the M.A. is in fact to be viewed as being a service to interested laymen, I would suppose one would want it to be general in scope, elevated only somewhat in content about what one gets at the B.A. level.

A much more serious objective of M.A. is in training teachers and in providing some of the basis for certain vocations such as journalism. One must take the M.A. seriously as teacher training; and therefore ask what it should do in terms of such training.

I think I would argue it should try to do these things as well as it can. First it should provide (through certain papers) a solid breadth in field of history so that the teacher will have had enough work in and across history to be able to handle with confidence his or her teaching assignments in schools and colleges. Second, it should in at least one field (or paper) provide real depth and substantial knowledge. The M.A. should have one field (or paper) in which he or she has done substantial work, much extra reading and probably at least one research paper or essay. This gives the M.A. a feeling of a know-how about research and about sources in at least one area or field or time-span of history e.g. in Medieval Indian History as an example. This M.A. training should include some systematic work (training) in research methods in historiography systematic and or in historical methodology. This is especially important in India because after the M.A. is completed those who continue for a Ph.D. do not get any additional systematic training.

In the United States we require our graduate students to take a number of courses after the M.A. (including seminars), in which they get additional training in research methods and historiography. Since this is not generally done in India, this kind of training has to be included in the program of work for the M.A. It may well be that no more than one paper is required in the M.A. program to

impart this kind of training, but at least one such paper needs to be there.

Last year I served as external examiner of three different doctoral dissertations in Indian universities. In each case it was apparent to me that the student could have written a much better dissertation if he or she had been exposed to some solid and systematic training in research and in methodology.

In the general or survey papers I would think one would tend to stress basic information (factual knowledge) with some livening admixture of analysis of historical processes. In the special paper designed for real depth on a particular topic or field of history one would add intellectual training in basic techniques of analysis and testing of evidence; while in the paper on research method one would stress everything that goes into a sound training for creative research.

In my opinion the M.A. would not need more than five papers in history. Three would be general, one in depth and the fifth in research. He or she would, however, take one or possibly two additional papers outside of history. One in another discipline so as to get an awareness of the approach and subject matter of another discipline and the other in a field related to history, but not in history. Thus a student might take a paper in Modern Indian Literature to complement his work in Modern Indian History. These seven papers, if well done, would provide the M.A. with a good education.

The other problem to which I must advert is that of numbers. I do not believe postgraduate education can be profitably pursued that when M.A. classes have 100 or more students in them. Even if some of the classes have to be larger, some of the classes must be smaller. The biggest graduate course I have ever taught in the United State had 25 students enrolled in it. In India last year I had 142 students in the sixth year M.A. class I taught, and that was too big for graduate level instruction. If postgraduate studies in India are to have real significance these large enrolments must be cut down. At least in some of the papers the enrolments should not be permitted to go above 25.

I shall also comment on the syllabus. In general, I feel the syllabus is too wooden and rests too much upon a few good text books. That is alright for undergraduate survey education; it is not intellectually adequate for graduate level education. It is alright to have required readings in a few good text books, but there must also be supplemental readings in monographs, in journal articles, and in

other more intensive and more detailed sources, including some readings in primary sources.

I think it might be wise to abandon the printed syllabus entirely. In its place could be put a mimeographed syllabus which would indicate basic readings in essential text books and additional readings and sources in a range of other academic and scholarly materials bearing on the topic of the class (paper). This would at least familiarize the graduate student with the kinds of materials he can turn to if he wants to get a closer and deeper look at his subject matter. I would also encourage the teacher to give his students his own bibliography as a supplement to the mimeographed syllabus.

This means some reshaping of the examination questions. They cannot reflect only the text books that are listed in the printed syllabus, nor should they. It would be good for the M.A. student if he or she knew that the examination would not be tied so closely to the items in the syllabus.

Even if it were to be true that M.A. studies cater to people who make "little or no use of their historical knowledge in their day-to-day work", it does not follow that reform is not needed. Even for people who make little use of historical knowledge, it is essential that they be given sound, imaginative and probing training. Their behaviour in any walk of life will reflect, at least in part, the kind of training they have had in their M.A. India needs more men who can think and analyze effectively and critically, who can probe a problem deeply, and who know what research means. My suggestions are all designed with that in mind, even though I have put them largely in the context of better training for those who will use their historical training in their later careers.

(c) Professor Holden Furber, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

With regard to the M.A. program in general, my experience of teaching in India, 1950-51 (University of Madras) and 1962-63 (University of Bombay) leads me to feel that for all the candidates there should be a sharper difference between the first year and the second year. In the first year there could be a reduction in the number of papers and a requirement that examinations should be taken in those papers at the end of the first year. For the second year I would feel that the emphasis should not be on listening to lectures, but on the writing of a very limited number of research

papers and reports. Such papers and reports to be judged not by external examination, but by two readers from the local staff, one of whom has advised the student in regard to his paper. I would even say that perhaps two long research papers should be enough. At present there are far too many M.A. students who are writing as many as eight short papers which give no training whatever either in good writing or in research method.

The whole M.A. program needs further emancipation from the tendencies which promote 'note—learning' and dependence on specific books. I realize this is difficult in view of the large number of M.A. students not destined for a teaching career. I would by no means reduce the numbers, but I would say that more class room time devoted expressly to 'question and answer' to promotion of discussion would make the M.A. program more attractive to all the students. Such discussion inevitably broadens the students' grasp of English as well as the subject in hand.

(d) Professor Joel Hurstfield, Department of History, University College, London

There are two general observations about postgraduate work that should be stated. Postgraduate study does not necessarily involve research ; and it may be that the issue as a whole will be simplified if this is recognized. This is linked with my second general point (which is implicit in the memorandum as a whole) that the nature and quality of postgraduate research is at every stage determined by the staff-student ratio. If the allocation of the number of students to each teacher is more than about ten, I would assume that it is beyond the capacity of one man to conduct research supervision in the fullest sense of the word.

In the light of this one thinks of postgraduate work on two levels. For the majority of students and teachers, the first higher degree, that is the M.A., can best be planned if students are doing advanced work in their subject rather than research work. My personal view is that in these cases both aspects of the curriculum referred to on page 3 and following should be developed. A student should study some large aspect of world history in breadth ; he should at the same time be studying a relevant discipline such as economics, political science or sociology. Thirdly, he should dig deep in his chosen field. For this third division of his study it is indispensable that he should familiarize himself with the source

material (either in print or original documents) which he should be trained to test according to well known historical principles. One would hope also that a minority of students who distinguish themselves especially in this third part, would then go on to the Ph. D. which should be a research degree. I consider, however, that the four main points made on page 5 are essential for an ordinary higher degree, that is the students should by now be moving towards monographs and away from secondary literature.

I consider too that it is immensely important that the evaluations of the student's work should be based on his capacity to think for himself as indicated at the bottom of page 5 rather than simply collect established facts and opinions. The true historian is, of course, the man who is familiar with established facts and opinions, or knows how to gain access to them, but is not restricted by them. He has been trained in the art of independent historical judgment. I think, therefore, that "questions of a critical nature" should not be optional for the M.A. degree but compulsory. There should also be, as is suggested on page 6, some system of a "starred first" for the man who shows original qualities. Indeed I would withhold a first class degree from any one who did not. I consider too that to proceed to M.A. a student should have obtained an earlier degree in history or take "qualifying papers" to enable him to reach the necessary standard.

In the light of the heavy pressure for postgraduate places at Indian universities it may, therefore, be the case that not until the Ph. D. degree will true research become possible. For this purpose I think the proposals set out on page 7 of the memorandum are very helpful. I believe that at the level the work will be conducted mainly in the form of seminars and personal supervision rather than by a system of lectures. When it comes to chosen fields I consider that there should be larger development in those fields of study which have a special relevance to India's own history, *e.g.* South-East Asia ; but it is essential that a minority of students at some universities should have ample facilities to study more "remote" subjects *e.g.* medieval Europe, or facilities should be provided for them to pursue these studies abroad. It would be a tragic loss to a great and cultured nation such as India if the more esoteric subjects were not also the subject of advanced and original work but I do not think that this situation is likely to arise.

(e) *Professor R.C. Majumdar, Calcutta*

One of the crying evils in the study of history today is the neglect to make use of it as an intellectual discipline and the tendency to regard it only as a store-house of information. Another is an unnatural craze for research without a due appreciation of its nature, method, and the necessary equipment, both intellectual and material. My views are mostly directed towards eradicating these evils.

While I fully appreciate the efforts made by the University Grants Commission to improve postgraduate teaching and research in history I have grave doubts whether any good will result from them so long as a more intelligent and effective test is not devised to ascertain the real qualification of students seeking admission to the postgraduate course and to estimate the proficiency acquired by them when they are thought fit to be awarded a degree. In other words, there must be a higher standard for the B.A. examination in order that those who are admitted to the postgraduate course are really in a position to profit by it and willing to do so. There should also be a higher standard for M.A. to ensure that the teachers appointed in colleges and universities by virtue of their degrees are really qualified to guide the students in their studies and research.

In course of interviewing candidates for the government and university appointments, possessing high degrees in history, I have been shocked by the very superficial knowledge and the absence of any critical faculty displayed by most of them even by those who have served as lecturers in first grade colleges for a number of years. One who had lectured for six years to B.A. students in a well-known college in a metropolitan city on the history of Europe, did not know of any country in Europe, which possessed an ancient civilization, like India, lost her freedom and recovered it only in the nineteenth century. He also told us that the Irish adopted the same method in their struggle for freedom as was adopted by Mahatma Gandhi in India. Can any system do any effective good so long as the students are taught by this type of teachers, and this type is by no means rare?

As regards research, the less said the better. As an examiner of doctoral theses in many universities I know what havoc is being created in the name of research. The specialization is going apace with vengeance. The candidates for doctor's degree, as a general rule, do not feel the necessity of having a general knowledge even of the period which has a great bearing on their theses, not to speak

of broadening the mind and sharpening critical faculty by a study of standard historical treatises. A candidate who wrote a thesis on the administration of a British Viceroy (I omit the name to avoid identity) when questioned about a connected problem during the administration of a predecessor who ruled about a decade before, said point blank, without any embarrassment that his concern was with the later Viceroy alone and not with his predecessor. One candidate dealing with slavery in ancient India had no knowledge of slavery in Greece or Rome or in any other country in the world. I need not cite more examples to show why I insist upon a research student possessing a wide general knowledge of history. So far as the development of critical judgment is concerned the situation is far worse. A candidate cited the example of a small rock-cut excavation by a king in ancient India as a positive evidence of the merciless exploitation of labourers and a dispute between members of two different castes as an indication of unceasing class wars in ancient India. Instances of such uncritical assertions and of assumptions without any foundation in fact and astounding statements without any basis or in direct contradiction of known facts may be multiplied to any extent. Yet these are approved by the supervisors, and, not infrequently, by the examiners appointed to adjudicate upon them.

I have devoted half a century to research work and I hope none will accuse me of an inherent dislike or aversion towards research. I regard it as highly important and one of the most important functions of universities. But research should be properly conducted and specialization at the cost of a sound general knowledge must be avoided. Original research requires a special kind of mental aptitude and intellectual equipment, and everyone is not suited for it. But the university teacher must have always the spirit of research—looking for new facts and new interpretation of known facts—and must communicate that spirit to his students. Anyone unwilling or unable to do this cannot properly fulfil the duty of a university teacher for postgraduate students

(f) Shri R. Nagar, Department of History, Faculty of Arts, Lucknow University, Lucknow

Medium of instruction being Hindi in all educational institutions in Uttar Pradesh, postgraduate students, extremely poorly equipped in the English language, are confronted with the strenuous problem

of consulting standard books which are available only in English, which they are not able to assimilate, or else, they are forced to depend on mere class room teaching and such books are available in Hindi, which, by and large, are of extremely poor grade. The problem to my mind, is not of switching over to English, which has to be replaced in gradual steps by Hindi. It is one of making immediate, comprehensive, concerted effort, to produce standard works in Hindi, and to have standard works in English immediately translated. Furthermore, if some of the schemes as envisaged in the memorandum, are to be implemented in a near period, then text books concerning Indian history have to be thoroughly revised and even replaced, for, even as it is when we have introduced new courses, for example Asian Culture, suitable text books simply do not exist even at the undergraduate stage.

(g) *Professor Burten Stein. College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, Minneapolis*

I would state my reaction to your letter on the first point as follows : I do not see that postgraduate training in history already difficult in India and elsewhere, need be further burdened with the objectives of providing non-historians with substantive knowledge of "seminal phases" in world history and some experience with historical method. It is my feeling that non-historians cannot be provided with encapsulated substantive and methodological material in history. This is a feasible expectation for the B.A. course when history is one of the core subjects in the liberal education of undergraduates, but it is quite unrealistic to expect to provide the same sort of thing, only more rich, for graduate students. I agree with the proposition that the non-historian or the historian who is likely to terminate his graduate degree with the M.A. profit from work in history. But, this work can only be fruitful if the graduate work in history is serious and undiluted. There is, I think, no substitute for the student seeking to gain training in the use of documents for historical research then to spend the time and engage in the full seminar experience. It is inconceivable to me, in any way, to vitiate the postgraduate seminar to accommodate either the non-historian or the historical student who is not essentially concerned with a full research commitment. The graduate seminar must be protected from this sort of dilution.

Related to this point is the issue of providing the historian with

good relevant training in other social sciences. I think that it is of the greatest possible importance in your country and mine. Training in social science subjects can have two very important effects which you mention in your letter. Training in some or several social science fields inevitably alerts the historian to possibilities in his research which he could not be aware of without such training. It is not a denigration of historiography in India to point out the emphasis which has been given to political and dynastic history. One of the factors in this is the lack of sensitivity on the part of some Indian historians to problems other than political. Serious training in some social science certainly would alert historian to possibilities in the fields of social and economic history which have been neglected. The second effort of social science training is that this would equip the historian to deal with the research materials in social and economic history.

REPORTS

Acc. No. 5577

CHAPTER 4

OBJECTIVES

THE SEMINAR on postgraduate teaching and research in history, began with a discussion on objectives. Professor Bisheswar Prasad initiated the discussion by referring to the questions posed on objectives in the working paper. He felt that there was general agreement on the fact that postgraduate work should be in the nature of more intensive and specialized studies, and suggested that the structure should be in the form of a pyramid with the B.A. (Hons.) based on a wide coverage of history, the M.A. more narrow in range and the Ph.D. being the apex of the degree system. Postgraduate studies should therefore aim at inducing the student into specialization and producing good historians. Such a process would also produce effective school teachers. The tendency to cater for prospective candidates for the competitive examinations in the M.A. courses, should be avoided.

The point that not every university has a B.A. (Hons.) degree was raised, since this has led to a lack of uniformity in the structure of the degree system in the country. It was also suggested that the reason for the teaching of history and the method of teaching must be analysed and a distinction made between what is desirable and what is practical. The practical aspect was dependent on the nature of the undergraduate and his background, the availability of staff in relation to students, and the techniques of transmitting knowledge—as for example, a stress on seminars in preference to lectures—the latter being in turn dependent on resources and equipment.

Apart from training both historians and school teachers and providing an understanding of world civilization, it was suggested that the study of Indian history might also contribute to the furthering of national integration in India. This led to some discussion regarding the history teacher vis-a-vis nationalism and it was generally felt that the inculcation of such ideas had best to be left to the preferences of individual teachers and should not be made a clearly defined objective of postgraduate studies. However, research on

problems relating to national cultures should be encouraged. But it was important to emphasize that the teaching of history is the teaching of an academic discipline and the student should be trained to evaluate past events. By raising the standard of historical analysis, objectivity would be heightened.

On the question of what was desirable and what was practical, it was suggested that if there was too great a contradiction between the two, then a compromise solution must be sought. This could be attempted by

1. Insisting that students from other disciplines should normally not be admitted to M.A. history. Furthermore, even the admission of B.A. Pass together with B.A. (Hons.) student to M.A. courses resulted in there being two levels of students in the M.A. and this made for a lowering of standards, and steps should be taken to avoid this.
2. That the M.A. should have both general and specialized papers, with more emphasis on specialized papers.
3. That if the standard cannot be raised everywhere, there must at least, be several centres where the standard aimed at will be comparable with the best international standards and ultimately these centres will be used to set the pace.

The general feeling appeared to have been in favour of more intensive historical studies at the postgraduate level with a view to encouraging the furtherance of history as an academic discipline.

CHAPTER 5

CURRICULUM

PROFESSOR A.C. BANERJEE who initiated the discussion raised the question of the extent to which the M.A. syllabus should be divided between general papers and specialized papers. Since the objectives of M.A. teaching had been earlier stated to be a compound of catering for people entering the lay professions as well as school, college and postgraduate teaching, due weight should be given to general papers as well as specialized papers. Professor Banerjee felt that specialization of the right type was only possible in the teaching of Indian history, since in the teaching of the history of other countries, only English works could be used and few specialist teachers of the history of other countries were likely to be available for some time. A general training in different subjects should stimulate those people who wanted to carry on research later. At present, given low library facilities, and lack of adequate monographs, students should not be compelled to learn a foreign language, but they should be encouraged to do so. Some selective reading of source materials was necessary.

A thesis or dissertation at the M.A. level could be permitted, but not in lieu of the requisite number of papers prescribed for all students; it should only be supplementary to the course as a preliminary for research training.

During discussion, some saw difficulties in specialized teaching in view of the fact that English, the medium of instruction at the M.A. level, was not easily understood by the bulk of the students. They thought that the introduction of more specialized papers should be begun only in the older universities which had more resources than the newer ones. It was pointed out that only if there was specialization in some M.A. papers, would it become unnecessary to have an intermediate course between M.A. and Ph.D.

It was felt that use of the term "intensive" instead of the term "specialized" would help to clarify what were our aims in M.A. teaching. It was agreed that strictly speaking a specialized paper requires the study of source material for getting training in how to evaluate

different types of sources. To be successful these have to cover very short periods on which there is general consensus of opinion. But general papers are designed to show processes of change, and introduce the student to seminal fields of historical study which are rich in standard monographs and learned papers. At the M.A. level such general papers should be so designed as to make it possible for the students to grasp processes of change not out of one tertiary work, but out of a number of recognized authorities in that field. Thus, specialized or general, teaching should always be intensive. One scholar suggested that the specialized papers, which required study of sources, could be partly examined in the shape of a dissertation.

It was generally felt that surveys of big periods of history aiming to impart information about human civilization should be disposed of at the B.A. level.

Many misgivings were felt as to how far these aims could be implemented, but it was agreed that if there is more apportionment of resources and a better utilization of them, then most of these aims could be put into effect, especially in universities with a long academic tradition.

On the subject of teaching the histories of countries other than India there was general agreement. It was pointed out that in teaching such papers—whether specialized or general—we should aim at the same level of intensity as we would normally for a paper on Indian history. Otherwise their value as a discipline will not be realized.

As regards the teaching of the histories of different parts of India as subjects by themselves, it was agreed that a paper on the history of the region in which the university was situated should be taught. Moreover, to overcome parochialism, each university should teach the history of another region.

Coming to the question of linguistic equipment necessary for M.A. students, one scholar proposed a formula that it should be encouraged, but not made compulsory. Some others, on the other hand, strongly felt that especially in Ancient Indian history it was an imperative necessity for M.A. students to learn the language of the source material, because translations were no use in evaluating the sources. It was noted with great misgivings and humiliation that knowledge of Sanskrit and Persian was diminishing among Indian historians.

On the basis of these discussions the following report of recommendations on the curriculum were agreed to :

(a) The seminar was of the view that all the papers at the M.A.

level should be taught at an advanced level. In all cases survey papers covering very big periods of history are to be covered at the B.A. (Hons.) level and not at the M.A. level. Some of these papers should be of a specialized character covering limited periods based on the study of the source material. The other papers may cover a comparatively wider period in which the process of change may be brought out. But even in the latter case, the students be required to study the standard works, including monographs. The M.A. syllabus in history should not comprise merely of papers dealing with Indian history, but also include papers relating to the history of countries other than India.

(b) It is visualised that in most of the universities, M.A. students will be required to take specialized papers in one of the three periods of Indian history. However, it was felt that in selected universities, opportunities may be provided for taking specialized papers in the history of some country or region outside India. At such universities, facilities should be provided for continuing advanced study and research in the history of such a country or region beyond the M.A. level. In other universities also, at least one of the specialized papers should relate to regions other than India.

(c) Every university should attempt to provide facilities for specialization in each of the three periods of Indian history. Encouragement may be provided to the universities to develop the study of the history of the different regions other than the one in which the university is situated, provided that the requirements of teaching the subject as an academic discipline are maintained and that the history of the region is studied in the wider perspective of the history of the country as a whole.

(d) Facilities may be provided in some particular aspect of Indian history, such as economic history or the history of fine arts, social history, etc.

(e) For the specialized papers, the study of the source material should be insisted upon. It would be desirable to encourage the students to study the source material in the original language, but the knowledge of the original language should not be insisted upon at the M.A. stage. It would, however, be helpful if universities could provide facilities to the M.A. students to learn, as an extra-curricular subject, the language in which most of the original sources are to be found.

CHAPTER 6

ASSESSMENT AND PRIOR TRAINING

THE QUESTION of prior training was taken first. It was desirable that the B.A. (Hons.) course based on 15 years' instruction should be made universal to improve the quality of students who enter the postgraduate stage. General consensus was that by and large preference should be given during admission to honours graduates on the basis of such an ideal honours course based on 15 years' instruction. But we should be sufficiently flexible to take into account all present realities, and at present admission of pass degree holders is permissible, subject to requirements made by the universities, and discretion should also be left to the Admission Committee to make exceptions for good honours students from other disciplines.

Discussion on Assessment was initiated by Dr. A. Tripathi. He argued that we should give more emphasis to thinking correctly and creatively and less on cramming facts. The aim of the examination should be to test intensive reading and critical judgment. Abolition of the marking system by numerical numbers and institution of grading by letters of the alphabet, the desirability of judging the paper as a whole or giving equal emphasis on each question, all these points were discussed at length. It was pointed out that while the present system does have many defects and encourages cramming, judging the paper as a whole, without specifying the number of questions to be answered or increasing the number of alternatives may have other dangers like skipping part of the course, etc. It was agreed, however, that one should aim to test the intensive study and ability to think for oneself and in this context the nature of questions, as well as the number of alternatives are important factors. The policy of evaluation should be consistent with the aim of giving advanced education at postgraduate level. On the basis of these discussions, the general recommendations were as follows :

1. Questions should be of a critical nature framed in such a way as would test the student's knowledge of standard authorities, the ability to have thought about historical processes and his powers of critical judgment.

2. The present system of assessing individual questions be retained in a modified form so that a rigid adherence to a statistical average of all the answers be avoided, and allowance is made for evaluation of the paper as a whole.

3. The present obligation of having to answer 5 questions in three hours is too much and if the duration of an examination paper is three hours, the number of questions to be attempted should be less than 5.

4. Whether a *viva voce* should be taken to be left to the individual university.

5. In all special subjects, the question paper must include at least one compulsory question on sources.

CHAPTER 7

RESEARCH

1. THE SEMINAR endorsed the plan undertaken by the University Grants Commission to establish advanced centres of research in history in various universities, and urged that practical steps in this direction be taken as early as possible.

2. *Research grants* : Since it is comparatively difficult to secure a first class in M.A. in history, it was felt that in the case of history, eligibility to research scholarships offered by the U.G.C. should not be restricted only to students securing a first class in M.A. history. Even those who have obtained a second class in their M.A. but have done a certain amount of research work demonstrating their aptitude for the same should be considered eligible for these scholarships.

3. The U.G.C. was requested to increase the travel grants made available to the universities to enable research students to make use of research materials or other facilities away from their normal headquarters.

4. A certain number of research fellowships allocated to different universities by the U.G.C. should be earmarked for history.

5. The seminar recommended that the U.G.C. should provide adequate financial assistance to selected universities to organize advanced research in the history of countries outside India, especially for books and journals, and to enable research workers in the history of countries other than India to travel abroad and to enable universities to invite Visiting Professors from abroad, and to build up a proper library.

6. *Pre-requisites and training for research* : It was generally recognized that the level of competence of students enrolled as Ph.D. students is not, as a rule, adequate. It was recommended that before granting admission to any student the department must satisfy itself that the student possesses sufficient linguistic equipment and a knowledge of the scripts in which manuscript records and sources are written so that he could make use of the major portion of his source materials.

7. It was urged that in all universities arrangements should be made to provide the Ph.D. students, training in the techniques of research and facilities for imbibing the essentials of allied subjects, under the general direction of his supervisor. Unless the supervisor certified that the student had undergone this necessary training, he should not be permitted to submit his thesis for approval.

8. It was recommended that more than usual attention should be paid to the choice of subjects for Ph.D. theses. As a rule, the subjects should be narrow and specific enough to allow possibility of original work.

9. It was recommended that the number of Ph.D. students working under the supervision of any teacher should not exceed ten. The supervisor should normally meet the students and discuss their works at least once a week, and this work of supervision should be considered as part of his teaching load.

10. Since teachers in colleges and universities constitute the major section of research students, and since it is considered essential for their professional work that they should undertake research it was urged that they should be granted study leave on liberal terms to enable them to pursue their research work. Even when the teacher is on leave without pay, his salary increment should not be adversely affected. The U.G.C. was requested to assist the institutions to make it possible for teachers to obtain leave with pay and provide other financial assistance.

11. It was felt that as far as possible research fellows or assistants appointed to further research on particular subjects as part of a special project should be given due recognition for their collaboration in all publications based on their researches. Where possible, such research assistants may be given opportunities for investigating independently some aspect of a wider project, under the direction and supervision of a senior scholar.

12. *Library and archival facilities* : Since advanced research should be a normal part of the activities of a postgraduate department of history, the department should pay a special attention to the organization of research activities, particularly of co-operative work in different branches of history. For this purpose, sufficient grants to various universities were urged for establishing research libraries, collection of manuscripts, micro-films, photographic equipment, etc., and to obtain services of research scholars, assistants as well as of the services of senior teachers and technical secretarial assistance. The cadre of the departments should also be enlarged

with a view to reducing the teaching load on individual members, to enable them to devote more time on research work, and to make possible the formation of teams of researchers who could directly benefit from their work on related fields. Every history department must be enabled to acquire at least all printed material on at least one branch or period of history.

13. The seminar appealed to the archival and record offices to relax, wherever possible, the various restrictions on researchers seeking to utilise the records. The universities were urged to collaborate with the archives and record offices in preparing works of reference on documentary material. It was hoped that the U.G.C. will enable the universities to undertake such programmes.

14. Welcoming the interest of the U.G.C. in this matter, it was recommended that practical steps should be taken to arrange for publication of reprints of important out-of-print monographs, articles from back number of journals, etc. Approved theses, either typed or micro-filmed, should be made available to the university libraries, if not available in print.

CHAPTER 8

INTER-DISCIPLINARY APPROACH

THE DISCUSSION on inter-disciplinary approach was initiated by Dr. Devanesen. He emphasized the unity of knowledge but felt that at times the vested interests of narrow specialists stood in its way. He pleaded for making a vigorous effort in preventing the process of learning from becoming more and more about less and less. Recognising the unity of knowledge, he stressed the need for devising methodology and techniques in such a way that the disciplines remained inter-related and the mind was not compartmentalised. He was also of the view that students should be given a free choice in offering different courses. Dr. Devanesen pointed out the need of allowing students to have more than one supervisor and of encouraging teachers to work also in fields other than their own.

The discussion centred on two main points :

- (i) Is inter-disciplinary approach necessary for the study of history?
- (ii) If it is so, how can it be done ?

Some members of the seminar expressed the view that there should be inter-disciplinary training at the postgraduate level, which could be done through seminars or by prescribing regular courses in allied disciplines. But the concensus of opinion was that inter-disciplinary training be provided at the Ph.D. level. In research subjects requiring discipline in more than one field supervision by two experts working in full co-operation could be extremely useful. It was stressed that a scheme of seminars on specific problems, held at regular intervals, to which senior scholars of history and allied disciplines should be invited, could considerably improve the standard of teaching and research.

CHAPTER 9

THE TEACHERS' ROLE

IN OPENING the discussion Dr. T. Raychaudhuri drew attention to the comments made by one colleague on the poor level of lectures and the absence of effective seminar work in most places. In particular, specialist teaching in many subjects is not available. All these follow from the high work load imposed on teachers, and attention was drawn to the digest prepared by the U.G.C. on this question. The initiator made a plea for better library facilities and equipping our departments with more specialist teachers, particularly teachers of the histories of other countries.

During discussion controversy arose at first over the role of seminars and tutorials. But eventually there was general concensus that lectures have to be supplemented by group discussions aiming to encourage reading and thought on controversial historical problem. One way of improving the quality of lectures which at their worst tend to become a rehash of text books was to encourage the covering of a small part of the course by the student's own reading. This would enable the lecturer to devote more critical attention to the bulk of the course. It was pointed out that this would work well only with good library facilities to help the student's reading and there was general dissatisfaction with the poor book-student ratio as well as poor staff-student ratio. Too much teaching work given to a teacher on a number of different fields is detrimental to the teaching at the postgraduate level. It prevents him not only from doing research, but also from the absolutely essential task of keeping up-to-date in his reading.

On the basis of these discussions, the following recommendations were made :

1. *Function of lectures, seminars & tutorials*

We realize the dangers that exist in too much lecturing on the present pattern i.e. tendency to repeat a few text books, to foster the habit of cramming, and to give too little opportunity to the student

to do his own reading and develop the faculty of thinking. Therefore, lectures should be supplemented by seminars, i.e. group discussions around important historical problems, and in some places it may be necessary to have tutorials and preceptorials to give the backward student much more intensive drilling in the subject.

But these laudable ideas can be fulfilled if certain specific steps are also taken. The library must be equipped with enough copies of important reading matter so that all students can do the necessary preparation for seminar work. Seminars, if they are to be taken seriously, need to be integrated more effectively with the lecture course. The prior publication of a lecture list at the beginning of a term which will have relevant reading matter and give indications of the problems that would be tackled in group discussions are to be encouraged.

2. *Teachers' work load*

The recommendations just made can only be fulfilled by easing the teacher's work load along certain lines :

- (a) Normally a postgraduate teacher should be required to lecture in the principal field of his specialization, provided that where necessary he may be asked to lecture in not more than one other field.
- (b) No postgraduate teacher should do more than two courses, and these, as far as possible, should relate to the broad field of his specialization. This is absolutely necessary to arrest the tendency to make mechanical reproduction of text book material in a field which is not related to the teacher's specialized field.
- (c) In no case should a teacher do more than a maximum of 12 periods a week, of which not more than half to be lectures, and the remainder should cover not only seminar and tutorial work but also time spent in supervision for research degree.

3. *Teachers' facilities*

It follows from the above that more investment is necessary in each of the following fields :

- (a) More staffing in general to improve the pupil-teacher ratio so that seminars are effective, and specialized teaching work has justice done to it.

- (b) A special effort be made to make good the great dearth of specialized teachers in the histories of countries other than India. Scholarships should be given to deserving people to get training in foreign universities in the basic history degree, and provision be made for absorbing these scholars in history departments to strengthen the teaching of the history of other countries, both for postgraduate and undergraduate teaching. Full use should be made of exchange programmes, summer schools, etc. to sustain the quality of teaching in these fields. In addition, liberal library facilities should be provided to these teachers to keep abreast of developments in their fields, and moderate facilities be also provided for continuing original research therein.
 - (c) For all types of history teaching,—Indian history or the histories of other countries—more liberal provision should be made for equipping libraries with relevant books and journals.
 - (d) While the research output of a teacher should be given proper weight, and part of the time which he will find available to him in an easier work load should be used for research, he is also to be encouraged to use part of this time in keeping abreast of his field. Facilities should be developed to encourage group discussion among teachers to enable them to keep in touch with developments in their fields.
 - (e) Liberal provision for periodical leave with full pay to encourage research, which is known as sabbatical leave should be made a regular part of a university teacher's term of service. In all cases, such leave should be granted at regular intervals of not more than 7 years and preferably less.
4. When considering promotion prospects, good teaching of a high order be given adequate weightage and an undue emphasis on the sheer quantity of research output be avoided.
5. The seminar recommended that services of experienced and specialized university teachers be utilized for preparing books in regional languages on history for the use of school and college students.

CHAPTER 10

RECOMMENDATIONS

THE VARIOUS recommendations of the University Grants Commission seminar on postgraduate teaching and research in history under the headings of objectives, content, research, and role of the teacher have drawn attention to many ideals that are badly in need of fulfilment, and without which no breakthrough is possible out of the vicious circles that bedevil higher education at present. It is important, in concluding, to highlight the operational significance of these recommendations, so that a systematic allocation and utilization of these resources may take place. These operational issues concern material provisions for (i) better staffing arrangements (ii) better scholarships and research grants (iii) better library and archival facilities and finally, (iv) better secretarial and allied facilities for expediting academic work (v) effective planning for upgrading honours teaching. Detailed recommendations on these five general problems are tabulated below, to draw the attention of the relevant authorities namely, the universities, the history departments, the University Grants Commission and the Government of India.

The universities in general

1. Develop and make universal the practice of having a B.A. (Hons.) course in history based on 15 years' instruction (including years spent at school). This is necessary to maintain the standards which have been fixed for postgraduate history teaching, and to ensure that there is no backsliding.
2. To make provision for regular leave with full pay to encourage research. This leave—known as the 'Sabbatical' leave should be granted periodically at intervals of not more than seven years, and its duration should be sufficiently long to facilitate research. (See Report on Teachers' Role).
3. University history departments should be given facilities to cooperate with government archives in helping them to prepare works of reference.

4. While the research work of a teacher should be given proper weight, good teaching of a high order with evidence of having kept abreast of research in his field, should be considered with favour in considering promotion prospects. An undue emphasis on the sheer quantity of research output should be avoided.
5. In no case should a teacher do more than a maximum of 12 periods a week, of which not more than half should be lectures, and the remainder should cover not only seminar and tutorial work, but also time spent in guiding research. This is necessary in view of the need for intensive teaching at the postgraduate stage.
6. Normally a postgraduate teacher should lecture in the principal field of his specialization. He should not be given more than two courses to teach.

These are necessary to arrest the tendency to make mechanical reproduction of text book materials, which harms the purpose of intensive teaching at the postgraduate level.

Departments of history in particular

1. A postgraduate teacher is not to be given more than two courses, and these, as far as possible, should relate to the field of his specialization.
2. In no case should his teaching load exceed 12 hours a week of which not more than half should be lectures (see above, item 5, under universities).
3. Seminars should be integrated more effectively with the lecture course. A lecture list published at the beginning of a term should indicate how the bulk of the course is to be covered. It should provide reading lists for :
 - (i) important topics which are to be treated intensively at seminars.
 - (ii) the small number of topics which the student could be expected to cover by his own reading.

(It is understood that this recommendation pre-supposes good library facilities. Attention of the U.G.C. is being drawn on this count).

4. To facilitate the absolutely essential task of keeping abreast in one's field, and encourage the meeting of minds in related fields, teachers' seminars should also become a regular feature of the departments' work.

University Grants Commission

1. *Staffing in General* : Much more staffing is necessary to improve the pupil-teacher ratio, so that the history departments can fulfill the recommendations listed earlier.
Such staffing should aim at increasing the number of specialist teachers available. In each specialized field at least two teachers should be available in a big university.
2. *Staffing requirements for teachers of histories of countries other than India* : To make good the great dearth of specialist teachers in these fields, the University Grants Commission should make provision for creating specialized posts with promotion prospects. In such posts may be absorbed scholars who have taken the basic history degree of foreign universities and who are thus in a position to strengthen the teaching of the history of other countries.
3. In addition to creating posts, as outlined above, full use should be made of exchange programmes, summer schools, etc., to sustain the quality of teaching in the history of countries other than India.
4. *Library facilities in general* : To ensure that M.A. teaching in all aspects of history is of a high order ample library grants should be given to cover in each paper that is taught
 - (i) ten or more copies of each prescribed and recommended book to enable the students to do their own reading
 - (ii) most of the standard monographs in that field
 - (iii) up-to-date sets of the major journals in that field. In view of the fact that at present many such books are out of print, the U.G.C., should set up a small expert committee to prepare lists of major works on Indian and western history, which need to be reprinted by arrangement with the publishers.
5. *Specialist library facilities* : Where the U.G.C. has sanctioned a centre of advanced study in history, or where the U.G.C. has sanctioned a specialized post in the history of a country other than India, special provision must be made to have as thorough a collection of books and journals as possible. This is necessary to enable a specialized teacher to keep abreast of his field, and train future teachers.

6. *Specialized research facilities* : In all places where the University Grants Commission sets up centres of advanced study in Indian history or in the histories of other countries, it should make additional provision (over and above item 5) for the acquisition of published sources, calendars, and stocks of micro-films.
7. *Scholarships and grants in general* : The existing pre-doctoral and post-doctoral scholarships offered by the U.G.C. have not been considered attractive enough to draw bright students or teachers into research. The fixed monthly emolument of Rs. 300 for pre-doctoral and of Rs. 500 for post-doctoral research, should be modified by bringing them in line with the lecturer's grade, with provision for increment. (see also Report on Research).
8. *Fellowships for full-time teachers* : In view of the fact that many governing bodies of colleges do not give leave with pay to teachers who wish to do research, and in many instances stop their increment while they are on unpaid leave, the U.G.C. should see to it that its fellowships to such teachers are fixed in a way so as to make good this loss.
9. *Grants for research in a department* : Irrespective of the points made in the last two paragraphs, additional grants should be available to sustain research in a department, especially at centres of advanced studies. These may cover travel in India, employment of assistants, etc.
10. *Travel grants for research in the histories of other countries* : To maintain and make effective the recommendations made in paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 (on page 53), the U.G.C. should arrange for periodic travel grants of not less than a year, so that specialized teachers in this field can continue with some research, in addition to keeping abreast of published literature.
11. *Secretarial and allied facilities*. To implement most of the above requirements some financial provision should be made for important details as follows :
 - (i) Typists attached to the department to type drafts of research and learned papers.
 - (ii) Duplicating machine to assist the former type of work and produce lecture-lists and reading lists for students.
 - (iii) Appointment of additional library staff wherever a significant expansion or addition to the library's stock takes place.

- (iv) Air-conditioners for the hot summer months.

Government of India

1. *Financial provision for increasing the number of specialist teachers in the histories of other countries* : Under this the following steps should be taken :
 - (i) In view of the unanimous decision to redress the serious imbalance between the small number of such specialists and the large number of specialists in Indian history, the seminar strongly recommended that more scholars should use their visits to foreign universities for taking the basic history degree. The government is therefore urged not to refuse foreign exchange to scholars and students who wish to specialize in the histories of other countries by reading for a first degree in established seats of learning abroad.
 - (ii) In pursuance of the same aim, some of the scholarships and fellowships awarded by foreign governments and private bodies should be utilised for training specialists in the histories of other countries.
 - (iii) Exchange programmes could also be used as a supplement to further the above aims.
2. *Improvement in college and school teaching* : While the universities and the U.G.C. are following up the recommendations listed earlier, the government must take steps simultaneously to improve the quality of school teaching and college education, so that the B.A. (Hons.) degree becomes widespread and is given after a total of 15 years instruction.
 This will be assisted by the fact that the M.A.s, in history under the newly recommended curricula would be better equipped for teaching. But it will only be possible to sustain a qualitative improvement in such M.A.'s if the inflow of graduate students also improve in quality.
3. Publication of standard text books in history for school and college teaching in the regional languages—should the government undertake such scheme, the seminar recommended that the services of specialized teachers be used to produce such works.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PROGRAMME

GENERAL PRESIDENT—MAHAMAHOPADHAYAYA D.V. POTDAR
VICE-CHANCELLOR, POONA UNIVERSITY, POONA

Saturday,
11.1.1964

Welcome by Prof. K.L. Joshi,
Secretary, U.G.C.
Inauguration by Dr. C.D. Deshmukh,
Vice-Chancellor, University of Delhi, Delhi
Introduction by Shri P.N. Kirpal,
Secretary, Ministry of Education.

	“Objectives”	Chairman Initiator Rapporteurs	Dr. N.K. Sinha Dr. B. Prasad Dr. S. P. Sen Dr. R. Thapar
	“Content” (Curriculum)	Chairman Initiator Rapporteurs	Dr. S. Nurul Hasan Dr. A.C. Banerji Dr. B. De. Dr. P. S. Gupta
Sunday, 12.1.1964	“Content” (Assessment and prior training)	Chairman Initiator Rapporteurs	Dr. Nilakanta Shastri Dr. A. Tripathi Dr. B. De. Dr. P.S. Gupta
	“Research”	Chairman Initiator Rapporteurs	Mahamahopadhyaya D.V. Potdar Dr. Irfan Habib Shri A.C. Bose
Monday, 3.1.1964	“Inter disciplinary approach”	Chairman Initiator Rapporteurs	Prof. R.S. Sharma Dr. C. Devanesan Dr. O.P. Bhatnagar Dr. H.L. Singh
	“Teachers’ Role”	Chairman Initiator Rapporteurs	Dr. Satish Chandra Dr. T. Raychaudhuri Dr. P.S. Gupta Prof. M.N. Das
Tuesday 14.1.1964	“Reports and Recom- mendations”	Chairman	Shri P.N. Kirpal

APPENDIX B

WORK LOAD OF TEACHERS LECTURING IN THE POSTGRADUATE DEPARTMENTS

—Abstract—

(The proformas on the work load of university teachers were sent to all the universities in India. Fourteen universities supplied the information asked for. Of these, some could not supply information covering all the teachers in the department.

In the following abstract, the names of the universities have been omitted, each university being indicated serially by roman numerals. Information regarding the specialization of each teacher, the subjects taught by him or her and the number of working hours per week is tabulated separately for the individual universities. "Specialization" in this abstract means specialization either at the M.A. or the post M.A. research stage. Subjects studied as general papers for the M.A. degree in universities in India are not covered by this term).

<i>S. No. of University</i>	<i>Teacher's field of Specialization</i>	<i>Subjects taught (Indian)</i>	<i>Subjects taught (regions other than India, etc.)</i>	<i>Working hours per week*</i>
1	2	3	4	5
I (1)	Ancient and Mediaeval India	Indian History Archaeology	European History, World History, Modern Constitutions, Western Political thought	8
(2)	"	—	American History, French Revolution	12
(3)	Mediaeval India	Ancient and Modern India, Archaeology.	—	14
(4)	"	Mediaeval India	—	13
(5)	S. E. Asia (Recent Times)	—	Modern Europe American History	13
II (1)	Modern India	Modern India	—	9
(2)	"	Mediaeval India	American History Political Thought	9

*These include in many cases lectures to undergraduate classes. The latter is not included in the list of subjects taught.

1	2	3	4	5
III	(1) Indian History, Archaeology	Indian History	Historical Method	10
	(2) Modern India	..	European History	12
	(3) Indian History	..	European History Far East	12
	(4) Indology	Archaeology, Pre- history, Indian History	—	12
	(5) Indian History, Archaeology.	Indian History	—	12
	(6) Indian History, Epigraphy	Epigraphy	—	4
IV	(1) Mediaeval and Modern India	Mediaeval and Modern India	British History	18
	(2)	Modern Constitutions	18
	(3) Modern India	Modern India	American History	18
	(4) Modern India and Political Science	—	Modern Europe, World History (Recent Times) Political Thought	10
V	(1) Modern India	Mediaeval and Modern India	Political Thought, World History (Recent Times)	15
	(2) Mediaeval and Modern India	Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern India	—	16
	(3) Modern India	Modern India	British History	16
	(4) Ancient India	Ancient India	Far East	16
	(5) Modern India	Modern India	Modern Constitutions	16
VI	(1) Modern India	Modern India	—	10
	(2) Mediaeval India	Mediaeval India	Political Thought	15
	(3) Modern India	Modern India	Far East	18
	(4) Modern, Mediaeval India	..	—	17
	(5) Modern India	—	British History	9
VII	(1) Ancient India	Ancient India	—	6
	(2) Archaeology	Archaeology	—	10
	(3) Ancient India	Ancient India	—	10
	(4)	—	8
VIII	(1) Ancient and Modern India	Ancient India	S. E. Asia	12
	(2) Ancient India	..	Ancient World	14
	(3) Ancient India, Archaeology	Ancient India, Archaeology	—	13
	(4) Ancient India	Ancient India	—	16

	1	2	3	4	5
IX	(1)	Modern India	Modern India	European History, Far East	6
	(2)	Mediaeval India	Mediaeval India	—	4
	(3)	Modern India	Modern India	—	12
	(4)	Ancient and Mediaeval India	Ancient and Mediaeval India	—	6
	(5)	British and European History	—	European History Africa	9
	(6)	Ancient India	Ancient India	—	3
	(7)	„	„	—	18
	(8)	Mediaeval India	Mediaeval India	Modern Europe	18
	(9)	W. Asia (Recent Times)	Modern India	Far East	8
	(10)	Mediaeval and Modern India, Political Science	Mediaeval India	Modern Europe	12
	(11)	British History	—	British History	22
	(12)	Modern India	—	International Relations Modern Europe	9
	(13)	Mediaeval India	Mediaeval India	—	13
	(14)	Modern India and Political Science	—	African and American History	6
X	(1)	Mediaeval India	Mediaeval India	—	16
	(2)	Modern India	Modern India	European History	12
	(3)	Ancient India Modern India	Mediaeval India	British History	20
	(4)	Ancient India	Ancient India	—	15
	(5)	Modern India	Modern India	European, British and Far Eastern History	15
	(6)	Mediaeval India	Mediaeval India	British and European History	12
	(7)	Ancient India	Ancient India	European and World History (Recent Times)	9
	(8)	Mediaeval India	Mediaeval India	—	21
XI	(1)	Medieval India	Medieval India	History of Islam	16
	(2)	Ancient India	Ancient India	Ancient Near East, Political Thought	19
	(3)	„	Ancient India, Mediaeval India	Ancient Greece, Mediaeval Europe	15
	(4)	Modern India	Modern India	World History (Recent Times) International Organisation	17
	(5)	Modern India	Modern India	Political Thought Modern Constitutions	15
	(6)	International Affairs	—	International Relations, International Organisation, Modern Europe	17
	(7)	„	—	International Law	16

1	2	3	4	5
(8)	Modern India	Modern India	Mediaeval Europe, British History	18
(9)	Ancient India	Ancient India	—	16
(10)	„	„	—	15
(11)	„	Ancient India, Mediaeval India	—	3
XII (1)	Modern India	Modern and Mediaeval India	Historical Method	12
(2)	Modern India, Mediaeval India	—	Far East, Modern Europe	10
(3)	Mediaeval India	Ancient and Mediaeval India	British History	10
(4)	British and American History	—	British History, European and American History	8
(5)	Mediaeval and Modern India	Mediaeval and Modern India	—	6
XIII (1)	Modern India	—	—	14
(2)	„	Mediaeval India	Modern Europe, Far East	15
(3)	Modern India, British and European History	—	Middle East (Recent Times)	12
(4)	Modern India	Modern India	British History, International Law	15
(5)	„	„	—	13
(6)	„	Modern India Ancient India	—	17
XIV (1)	Ancient India	Ancient India	—	6
(2)	„	„	—	23
(3)	„	„	—	23
(4)	„	„	—	18
(5)	Ancient India, Archaeology	Ancient India and Archaeology	—	19
(6)	„	„	—	21
(7)	„	„	—	21
(8)	„	„	—	20

APPENDIX C

STAFF-STUDENT RATIO IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF HISTORY OF INDIAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

A BRIEF NOTE

IN RESPONSE to a circular issued by the University Grants Commission to different universities and certain affiliated colleges doing postgraduate work in history, on 12. 11. 1963, replies have been received from 15 university departments and more than 50 affiliated colleges, so far. Based on the information received, a brief note, giving the salient features relating to staff-student ratio is given below.

To start with it might be mentioned that the information called for concerned enrolment, staff and staff-student ratio at different levels of instruction namely graduate, postgraduate and research, for the past three years *i.e.* 1960-61, 1961-62 and 1962-63 from all the universities which had separate postgraduate departments in history and those affiliated colleges which were doing postgraduate work in the subject. It would appear that the teacher-pupil ratio in the "History Departments" of universities (varying from 1:4 to 1:20) is generally better than that prevailing in the affiliated colleges. At the postgraduate/research level there is better teacher-pupil ratio than at the undergraduate level. This remark applies both to university departments as well as colleges. Even among affiliated colleges, there are some which have a fairly good teacher-pupil ratio (particularly at the postgraduate level) comparable to that of university teaching departments.

The following tables illustrate this note. Table I (a), (b) and (c) give the actual position regarding enrolment, staff and staff-student ratio in the university departments of history during 1960-61, 1961-62 and 1962-63. Table II gives the range of variation in the staff-student ratio as apparent in the affiliated colleges.

TABLE I (a)

ENROLMENT, STAFF AND STAFF-STUDENT RATIO IN
HISTORY DEPARTMENTS
A TABULAR STATEMENT OF INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE UNIVERSITIES
1960—61

ENROLMENT

<i>S. No.</i>	<i>University</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Graduate</i>	<i>Post-graduate</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Total Staff</i>	<i>Overall Teacher-Pupil Ratio</i>
1.	Aligarh	145	114	22	9	20	1 : 7
2.	Annamalai	68	56	12	—	7	1 : 10
3.	Burdwan	45	—	45	—	5	1 : 9
4.	Gauhati	140	—	139	1	6	1 : 24
5.	Jadavpur	86	15	70	1	9	1 : 9
6.	Karnatak	21	—	17	4	3	1 : 7
7.	Lucknow	334	191	134	9	7	1 : 48
8.	Nagpur	15	—	15	—	4	1 : 4
9.	Panjab	72	—	57	15	9	1 : 8
10.	Patna	149	—	129	20	10	1 : 15
11.	Rajasthan	51	—	41	10	4	1 : 13
12.	S.V. Vidyapeeth	50	36	12	2	4	1 : 12
13.	Saugar	49	28	15	6	18	1 : 3
14.	Sri Venkateswara	21	9	12	—	9	1 : 2
15.	Visva Bharati	37	37	—	—	6	1 : 6

TABLE I (b)

ENROLMENT, STAFF AND STAFF-STUDENT RATIO IN
HISTORY DEPARTMENTS
A TABULAR STATEMENT OF INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE UNIVERSITIES
1961—62

ENROLMENT

<i>S. No.</i>	<i>University</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Graduate</i>	<i>Post-graduate</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Total Staff</i>	<i>Overall Teacher-Pupil Ratio</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Aligarh	188	164	17	7	20	1 : 9
2.	Annamalai	38	24	10	4	8	1 : 5
3.	Burdwan	84	—	84	—	8	1 : 10
4.	Gauhati	180	—	180	—	5	1 : 36
5.	Jadavpur	100	22	78	—	9	1 : 11
6.	Karnatak	26	—	24	2	3	1 : 8
7.	Lucknow	346	205	131	10	7	1 : 49

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8.	Nagpur	20	—	20	—	3	1 : 7
9.	Panjab	58	—	43	15	10	1 : 6
10.	Patna	163	—	141	22	11	1 : 15
11.	Rajasthan	43	—	38	5	4	1 : 11
12.	S.V. Vidyapeeth	72	57	14	1	4	1 : 18
13.	Saugar	51	32	17	2	18	1 : 3
14.	Sri Venkateswara	35	12	19	4	9	1 : 4
15.	Visva Bharati	52	52	—	—	6	1 : 9

TABLE I (c)

**ENROLMENT, STAFF AND STAFF-STUDENT RATIO IN
HISTORY DEPARTMENTS**

A TABULAR STATEMENT OF INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE UNIVERSITIES
1962-63

ENROLMENT

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>University</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Graduate</i>	<i>Post-graduate</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Total Staff</i>	<i>Overall Teacher-Pupil Ratio</i>
1.	Aligarh	175	146	21	8	20	1 : 9
2.	Annamalai	31	18	13	—	8	1 : 4
3.	Burdwan	98	—	98	—	7	1 : 14
4.	Gauhati	168	—	164	4	9	1 : 18
5.	Jadavpur	102	24	76	2	9	1 : 11
6.	Karnatak	34	—	20	14	3	1 : 11
7.	Kuruksetra	7	5	2	—	3	1 : 2
8.	Lucknow	410	264	136	10	7	1 : 59
9.	Nagpur	34	—	34	—	2	1 : 17
10.	Panjab	49	—	36	13	9	1 : 5
11.	Patna	165	—	140	25	11	1 : 15
12.	Rajasthan	37	—	32	5	5	1 : 7
13.	S.V. Vidyapeeth	89	70	19	—	4	1 : 22
14.	Saugar	57	35	19	3	18	1 : 3
15.	Sri Venkateswara	31	16	12	3	9	1 : 3
16.	Visva Bharati	63	57	6	—	10	1 : 6

TABLE II
STAFF—STUDENT RATIO
AFFILIATED COLLEGES

S. No. Universities	1960-61			1961-62			1962-63		
	G	PG	Res.	G	PG	Res.	G	PG	Res.
1. Agra	1 : 7 to 1 : 26	1 : 1 to 1 : 16	—	1 : 5 to 1 : 31	1 : 5 to 1 : 17	—	1 : 5 to 1 : 34	1 : 4 to 1 : 13	—
2. Bombay	1 : 3 to 1 : 13	1 : 3 to 1 : 4	—	1 : 1 to 1 : 17	1 : 3 to 1 : 13	—	1 : 3 to 1 : 14	1 : 2 to 1 : 6	—
3. Gujarat	(1 : 17)	(1 : 16)	(1 : 14)
4. Kerala	(1 : 13)	(1 : 16)	(1 : 14)
5. Madras	1 : 2 to 1 : 24	1 : 2 to 1 : 5	—	1 : 3 to 1 : 22	1 : 4 to 1 : 5	—	1 : 4 to 1 : 20	1 : 3 to 1 : 5	—
6. Nagpur	1 : 53	—	—	1 : 43	—	—	1 : 38	—	—
7. Panjab	1 : 11 to 1 : 30	1 : 2 to 1 : 30	—	1 : 7 to 1 : 34	1 : 4 to 1 : 31	—	1 : 8 to 1 : 43	1 : 3 to 1 : 21	—
8. Poona	1 : 22	1 : 25 to 1 : 26	—	1 : 13	1 : 16	—	1 : 7	1 : 15	—
9. Rajasthan	1 : 6 to 1 : 42	1 : 3 to 1 : 6	—	1 : 3 to 1 : 88	1 : 3 to 1 : 11	—	1 : 4 to 1 : 37	1 : 2 to 1 : 5	—
10. Saugar	1 : 17	—	—	1 : 12	1 : 1 to 1 : 4	—	1 : 18	1 : 2 to 1 : 4	—
11. Vikram	1 : 20	1 : 6	—	1 : 26	1 : 7	—	1 : 30	1 : 10	—

APPENDIX D

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1. Prof. A. C. Banerji
Centenary Professor of
International Relations,
Calcutta University,
Calcutta.
2. Prof. A. L. Basham
Head of the Department of the History
of South Asia,
School of Oriental and African Studies,
University of London,
London.
3. Prof. Bisheshwar Prasad
Head of the Department of History,
University of Delhi,
Delhi.
4. Dr. S. Bhattacharya
Deputy Secretary,
University Grants Commission,
New Delhi.
5. Shri K. D. Bhargava
Director of Archives,
New Delhi.
6. Shri O. P. Bhatnagar
Acting Head of the Department of History,
Allahabad University,
Allahabad.
7. Shri A. C. Bose
Head of the Department of History,
Visva Bharati,
Santiniketan.
8. Dr. Nand Lal Chatterjee
Research Professor under U.G.C. Scheme,
Lucknow University,
Lucknow.
9. Prof. K. de B. Codrington
Professor of Indian Archaeology
London University,
London.
10. Prof. M. N. Das
Head of the Department of History,
Utkal University,
Bhubaneswar.
11. Shri V. N. Datta
Head of the Department of History,
Kuruksetra University,
Kurukshetra.
12. Dr. Barun De
Associate Professor of History,
Indian Institute of Management,
Calcutta.
13. Dr. C. D. Deshmukh
Vice-Chancellor,
Delhi University, Delhi.

14. **Dr. Chandran D. S. Devenesan** Principal,
Madras Christian College,
Madras.
15. **Prof. R. E. Frykenberg** Professor of Indian History,
University of Wisconsin,
Madison,
U.S.A.
16. **Prof. J. Gallagher** Professor of Commonwealth History,
Balliol College,
Oxford.
17. **Dr. P. S. Gupta** Reader in History,
Delhi University,
Delhi.
18. **Prof. G. S. Halappa** Head of the Department of Political Science,
Karnatak University,
Dharwar.
19. **Dr. Irfan Habib** Reader in History,
Aligarh Muslim University,
Aligarh.
20. **Dr. P. M. Joshi** Director of Archives,
Bombay.
21. **Shri P. N. Kirpal** Secretary,
Ministry of Education,
New Delhi.
22. **Prof. Eugene P. Link** Professor of History,
Columbia University,
New York,
U.S.A.
23. **Dr. G. M. Moraes** Head of the Department of History,
Elphinstone College,
Bombay.
24. **Prof. A. K. Narain** Principal,
College of Indology,
Banaras Hindu University,
Varanasi.
25. **Dr. Richard L. Park** Representative,
Asia Foundation,
New Delhi.
26. **Prof. C. H. Philips** Director,
School of Oriental and African Studies,
University of London,
London.
27. **Mahamahopadhyaya
D. V. Potdar** Vice-Chancellor,
Poona University,
Poona.
28. **Dr. O. Ramachandraiah** Head of the Department of History,
Andhra University,
Waltair.

29. Prof. M. Ramarao
Head of the Department of History,
Sri Venkateswara University,
Tirupati.
30. Dr. T. Raychaudhuri
Reader,
Department of Economic History,
Delhi School of Economics,
Delhi University,
Delhi.
31. Shri. R. J. Shankland
Vice-Principal and Lecturer in History,
St. Stephen's College,
Delhi University,
Delhi.
32. Prof. K. A. Neelakanta
Shastri
Director,
Institute of Traditional Cultures (UNESCO)
Madras.
33. Dr. Satish Chandra
Head of the Department of History,
Rajasthan University,
Jaipur.
34. Shri B. Shiva Rao
Member,
University Grants Commission,
New Delhi.
35. Prof. R. S. Sharma
Head of the Department of History,
Patna University,
Patna.
36. Dr. S. P. Sen
Reader in History,
Calcutta University,
Calcutta.
37. Prof. N. K. Sinha
Asutosh Professor of Mediaeval and Modern
Indian History,
Calcutta University,
Calcutta.
38. Prof. H. L. Singh
Head of the Department of History,
Banaras Hindu University,
Varanasi.
39. Dr. (Miss) Romila Thapar
Reader in History,
Delhi University,
Delhi.
40. Prof. Amles Tripathi
Head of the Department of History,
Presidency College,
Calcutta.
41. Dr. Clanton Williams
Chief,
Education Division,
United States Agency for International
Development,
New Delhi.

