

A Factual Analysis of the Banaras Hindu University Mudaliar Committee Report

NIEPA DC



D32074

Sponsors

Khushal Chand Gorawala

Nand Dulare Bajpeyi

Rama Shankar Pande

Sarju Prasad Dube

Shiva Kumar

Bishwanath Singh

College for Educa
Sub. National Systems Unit,
National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration
17-E, Sa. Armando Marg., Delhi-110016
DOC* NOV 21 1984 *
Date.....

Sub. National Systems Unit,
National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration
17-E, Sa. Armando Marg., Delhi-110016
DOC. No. 2074
Date.... 31-12-84

PREFACE

In the following pages an attempt has been made to offer comments on what the Mudaliar Committee has to say about the Banaras Hindu University by way of criticism and by way of suggestions for its improvement. The Committee was set up by the Visitor in June, 1957. It carried on prolonged investigations and submitted its report practically after one year. The report was released to the press on the 14th of June, '58 and simultaneously an Ordinance was promulgated suspending the Constitution of the University and vesting the power of administration in the Vice-Chancellor and a nominated Committee of advisers. The Ordinance also made provision for a Screening Committee which is to examine the records of those University employees who are deemed dangerous or unworthy of service in the University. The report and the Ordinance raise certain issues involving questions of University autonomy, and social justice, and constitutional and legal propriety; and consequently they must be examined closely with a view to correcting the errors and redressing the wrongs which have ensued from them. For the readers' convenience we shall list here some of the major points arising from the report and the Ordinance:

(a) The report is obviously one-sided since it ignores all evidence against the Vice-Chancellor and the authorities of the University and overemphasises the shortcomings, real or imaginary, of teachers and thus tends to create a prejudice against them. There are sweeping generalisations based on stray facts with the purpose of denouncing certain classes and categories of teachers and students. *The report which depends more on opinions and less on facts is tendentious from the beginning to the end and is written with the obvious purpose of running down teachers and students of Eastern U. P. and Western Bihar. There are numerous factual errors and unwarrantable inferences have been drawn frequently.* Yet on the basis of this report the Visitor, perhaps on the advice of the Education Minister, put aside the constitutional provision of section 5(4) of the University Act and suspended the normal Constitution of the University. It is our submission that there was no grave emergency justifying the Ordinance and the report should have been sent to the University for remarks and replies before any step was taken on it. At any rate the Government should have waited for public comments and allowed Parliament to examine the report before anything was done on its basis. Thus steps which may spell disaster and end

in injustice and persecution have been taken in an unjustifiable hurry.

(b) The Mudaliar Committee started with a faulty major premise and hence all its inferences are vitiated and wrong. In the first instance the affairs of the University are not in such a sad plight as the Committee has suggested. In a large institution run by human beings, and not by angels, there will always be blemishes which can be removed without requiring extraordinary measures. The University has a teaching and administrative staff of about a thousand persons and a little less than ten thousand students come to it for education. It is not fair to denounce and condemn this large community by stressing stray cases which happened, if at all, in the course of a long period. Let an institution of the same magnitude be examined likewise and we are sure there will not be a total absence of flaws and blemishes. In this way the denunciation of the University is uncalled for and it is a pity that the great men who constituted the Mudaliar Committee did not hesitate in damaging the reputation of the University which has *ever since its inception been regarded as a great centre of learning and whose teachers and students have again and again made sacrifices for noble and patriotic causes.* It is even more regrettable that the Government has been so anxious to defame the University without even trying to find out the real situation.

(c) Another great presumption of the report is that for all the evils that are now rampant in the University a certain group known as the "Eastern U.P. Group" is responsible. The pre-occupation of the Committee with this presumption is so great that it has become purblind to all other causes and factors of deterioration. Every criticism offered ultimately moves round to one point, that the Eastern U. P. group is the devil of the piece and most of the recommendations that have been made, are with a view to eradicating this fictitious demon. The Court, the Council, and various other bodies, it has been suggested, must become undemocratic and be packed with nominated members because of the dread of the Eastern U.P. group. We have examined some of these facts in the following pages, but it is necessary to say here that on account of the phobia of the Committee based on malicious and alarming representations of the present Vice-Chancellor, the University Constitution may eventually be shaped in an improper manner and those who are supposed to constitute the Eastern U. P. group may suffer grievous wrong. Persecution was started long before the report was published and since the publication of the report there is a panic in the University that grave cruelties are going to be perpetrated by the Vice-Chancellor and his party with the support of the Government.

(d) The question of University autonomy is involved in the whole matter. The Government has been persistently and systematically tightening its grip on the University and the Ministry of Education has been treating the University in a preposterous manner. Not only does the Ministry dictate so far as the appointment of Vice-Chancellor is concerned, but also pulls the strings in the day-to-day affairs of the University. It is a well-known fact that the present Vice-Chancellor runs to Delhi to take instructions from the Ministry about matters which must be decided independently. In fact, the Education Ministry's hands have been present behind many things which the Vice-Chancellor has done. The Visitor does think on the advice of the Ministry and so whenever that august name appears, it is really the Ministry of Education which is functioning. Mahamana Pt. Malaviya wanted the University to be governed democratically. He also wanted that the portals of the University should be open to all, rich and poor alike. Perhaps he cared more for the poor than for the rich: The University was of the people and not only of the Government and yet any one who reads the Mudaliar report will easily see that simply because the Government now gives money, the whole pattern and purpose of the University is to be changed. How far it is proper and just to upset the tradition of the University and to ignore the purpose with which it was started, it is for the people and members of Parliament to decide. Is it really gracious for the Government to make the University pay such a heavy price for the financial help it receives?

In the end we appeal to the people and the people's representatives in Parliament to give serious thought to the crisis which has arisen in the affairs of the Banaras Hindu University. The University belongs to the nation and it must be saved from the onslaught which has been made on it. Even the British Government did not deal with the University in 1921, 1930-31, and 1942 when it was displeased with it, so drastically and autocratically as the present Government is doing now. Moreover, injustice and cruelty will create and perpetuate bitterness. All progress should be based on co-operation, goodwill and amity of all concerned. Above all we hope the honour of the University which is now in great jeopardy will be preserved. Once its prestige is gone, no constitutional changes can really save it from ruin.

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	... i-iii
1. Appointment of the Enquiry Committee : A vital Omission	... 1
The Personnel of the Committee	... 1
2. The Terms of Reference Restricted and Unsatisfactory	1
3. The Procedure	... 2
4. The List of Memoranda	... 2
5. Sittings of the Committee	... 3
6. The Committee Lapsed into a Personal Enquiry	... 3
7. The History of the University Misrepresented and Facts Twisted	... 3
8. Dark Picture Unrealistic	... 4
9. The Main Trouble	... 5
10. Forced Departure of Successive Vice-Chancellors from the University—A Malicious Myth	5
Speech of Sir C. P. in the Executive Council Meeting Held on April 8, 1956	... 7
The Last Panel for the Appointment of the Vice-Chancellor	... 8
Eastern U. P. and the Appointment of the Present Vice-Chancellor	... 8
The Present Vice-Chancellor and the Education Ministry	... 9
Speech of Sir C. P. Aiyer	... 9
Harassment of Eastern U. P.	... 9
The Myth of the Departure of the Successive Vice-Chancellors	... 9
The So-called Loss of All-India Character	... 10
The Number and Percentage of Teachers	... 10
The Number and Percentage of Students	... 10
Residential Character	... 11
Personal Contact	... 11
11. Standards of Admission.	... 12

12.	Affiliation	...	12
13.	The Number of Students and Facilities	...	12
14.	Unfortunate Reference to Poor Students of East U. P. and Bihar	...	13
15.	Unauthorised Increased Admissions: A false charge		13
16.	(i) Teachers' Responsibility for Indiscipline: A Stock Charge	...	14
	(ii) Concentration of Power in the Hands of Principals	...	15
17.	Constitution of the Selection Committee and Appointment of teachers	...	16
18.	A List of Relationships: Unreliable and Malicious Documents Used by the Committee	...	17
	Other Relationships Ignored	...	17
19.	Examinations and Examinerships	...	18
20.	Strike in the College of Technology	...	18
22-23.	The Responsibility for the Present Deterioration	...	20
24.	Student Welfare Problems	...	22
25.	The State of Sanitation	...	23
26.	Electrification	...	23
27.	Other Facilities of a Residential University	...	23
28.	Law and Order	...	23
29.	University Authorities and Discipline	...	23
30.	Charge of Immorality	...	24
31.	A False List of Litigations	...	25
32.	College of Technology	...	25
33.	Improvements Suggested	...	26
34.	Sarcastic Reference to Padmabhusan and the Presi- dent	...	27
35.	Summary	...	27
36.	Suggestions -	...	28
37.	Principalships and Chief Wardenships	...	28
38.	Principals in General vs. Dr. V. S. Jha	...	28
39.	Admissions and Eastern U. P.	...	29
40.	Causes of Agitation	...	29
41.	The Load of Work	...	29
42-45.	Procedure to be Adopted for Consideration: Most Unusual	...	30

	The Course of Natural Justice Disregarded	30
	Ordinance and a Small Group of Eastern U. P.: A Fallacy	30
	No Case of Emergency Justifying an Ordinance	3
46-47.	Admissions	31
	Wrong Aspersions on U. P. Government	32
48.	Ayurvedic College	3
49.	Women's College	3
51.	Constitution of the University Bodies	
	(i) Suspension of the Present Constitution, Unwarranted	33
	(ii) Screening Committee: An Instrument of Persecution must be dropped	33
52.	Revision of the Act. It must go to a Select Committee.	34
53.	The Visitor : Does not need further powers	34
54-55.	The Court : Suggestions Untenable in a Democracy	35
	The Court and the U. G. C.	36
56.	The Chancellor and the Pro-Chancellor : Ex Officio Appointment not Proper	36
57.	Rectors of the University	37
58.	The Appointment of the Vice-Chancellor: Direct appointment by the Education Ministry undesirable	37
62.	The Court : Its Powers and Composition	38
	Representatives of Ex-students	39
63.	The Executive Council	41
64.	Principalships	41
65.	Grouping of Departments	42
67.	Academic Council	42
68.	Standing Committee of the Academic Council	42
70-72.	Advertisements	43
77.	Ministerial Staff Association	43
80.	Conclusion	44
	Epilogue	45
	Analysis of the Appendices of the Report	47
	Appendix 1: List of Enquiry Committees Appointed by V. C.	49

Appendix 2(a): Number and Percentage of Teachers	...	50
Appendix 2(b): List of Principals	...	51
Appendix 3 : Number and Percentage of Students	...	53
Appendix 4 : Members of the Executive Council	...	55
Appendix 5 : Members of the Standing Committee of the Academic Council	...	56
Appendix 6 : Appointments During the Regime of the Present Vice-Chancellor	...	57
Appendix 7 : Mudaliar Committee Report, Appendix 3 : A Hoax	...	58
Appendix 8 : Mudaliar Committee Report, Appendix 4 : A Fake Document	...	59

***A Factual Analysis
of the Banaras Hindu University
Mudaliar Committee Report***

1. Appointment of the Enquiry Committee

A Vital Omission. There is no doubt that the Visitor of the University, the President of India, has a right to appoint such a Committee. But the manner in which the Executive Council and the Court of the Banaras Hindu University were kept in the dark and by-passed by the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. V. S. Jha, and the undue interest which was taken by the Education Ministry and the University Grants Commission, smack of some deep design. These influential agencies guided and influenced the entire procedure of the Enquiry Committee. The Vice-Chancellor was present throughout in the sittings of the Enquiry Committee and the evidence was managed and influenced by him. The papers and memorandum submitted by him to the Mudaliar Committee were never placed before the Executive Council and the Court of the Banaras Hindu University for ascertaining their opinion on the matter. Under the present Act (Section 5) proper notice by the Visitor to the University was necessary but it was not given. Section 5 of the Act requires that "The Visitor shall in every case give notice to the University of his intention to cause an inspection or an enquiry to be made." But no such notice was placed by the Vice-Chancellor before the Court or the Executive Council of the University before the Enquiry Committee was appointed and announced. An explanation from the University might have saved the prestige of the University. This was a vital constitutional omission.

The Personnel of the Committee. As regards the personnel of the Committee, nothing is to be said against the distinguished members. but it would have been proper, if somebody from the area near about the Banaras Hindu University, having a close knowledge of the University and its affairs, had been included. Perhaps the Education Ministry did not think it necessary to do so. The report strengthens this view. Had there been a member with such proper knowledge, the report of the Committee would have been less unbalanced, perhaps also fairer. The approach and attitude of the Committee as revealed in the report make us all the more convinced that a more representative Committee would have been much better.

2. The Terms of Reference Restricted and Unsatisfactory

The terms of reference of the Enquiry Committee were framed purely from the administrative point of view. The affairs of the University as a whole including the appointment of the highest

authorities of the University ought to have been investigated. Therefore the scope of reference was restricted and unsatisfactory and it could not give a complete picture of the affairs of the University. It is all the more regrettable that the Committee instead of confining the enquiry strictly to the terms of reference allowed itself to degenerate into an enquiry about the people of Eastern U.P. in the University and outside. This has made the report parochial, biased and unjust.

3. The Procedure

Certain officials of the University were improperly associated with the working of the Committee. Some of them were invariably present at the venue when the Committee visited Banaras in order to obstruct those who were likely to tender evidence against the authorities and helped the supporters of the Vice-Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor got himself elected representative of the University and was always present in the meetings and this deterred many people from appearing and others from expressing themselves frankly. Thus it is clear that the list of witnesses other than teachers consists mainly of the Vice-Chancellor's friends.

The Committee was housed in the Nadesar Palace of the Maharaja of Banaras, seven miles away from the University. *It did not visit the University, did not care to go round the Colleges and Departments and meet persons for the factual verification of evidence and for gathering first hand information.* This was a great draw-back in the working of the Committee. Under the circumstances the report of the Committee is based on hearsay evidence of one side—the officials of the University and their supporters. The evidence produced was never sifted and verified, with the result that the report is full of gross factual errors.

4. The List of Memoranda

The list of memoranda submitted to the Committee is not given. At least relevant extracts from the memoranda submitted by important associations and persons ought to have been given in the report in detail in order to give the reader, the public and Parliament an opportunity to compare the conclusions and suggestions of the Committee with the material before it. For instance, there is no reference to the Memorandum of the Teachers' Association and its contents. Teachers will be directly affected by any constitutional and administrative change in the University. Their views should not have been brushed aside like this. The memoranda submitted to the Committee were not verified, e. g., the appendices (3) and (4) are false, perverted and incomplete (Vide Supplement to Appendix 3 and Analysis of Appendix 4 of the Report). It will be shown in the following pages that many

statements in the report are not based upon facts. The Committee did not collect and examine independent data. Throughout the report the words "it was reported", "it was said", etc. occur. This really makes the authenticity of many affirmations made in the report doubtful. A few extracts from the evidence have been given. These are in every case hostile to the sections which are the main target of the Committee. Too much credence has been placed in these statements because they suited the Committee's purpose.

5. **Sittings of the Committee**

Sittings of the Committee at Banaras were most unsatisfactory. Dr. Subbroyan joined the meeting late, Justice Mahajan left the meeting early. The Committee was split into sections and evidence was collected indifferently, as if the Committee had already made up its mind and closed its mind against further evidence from Banaras. The Committee was at Banaras for four days only and did not visit the campus of the University.

6. **The Committee Lapsed into a Personal Enquiry**

When we compare the terms of reference of the Committee and the analysis of memoranda received by the committee it is clear that it lapsed into a personal enquiry committee against individuals of Eastern U.P. and Bihar. This vitiates the entire character of the report. The enquiry was on the whole not conducted on a high and impersonal level. The responsibility of the authorities of the University regarding general administration and discipline was almost completely ignored and consequently very little was said about it in the report. The whole report is directed against teachers and students of Eastern U.P. and Bihar. It creates invidious distinction between one region and another. The most unfortunate thing is that it seeks to divide East and West and North and South and thus to bring about disintegration in the life of the University. One fails to comprehend how this can be reconciled with the Committee's keenness evinced in the report that the University should retain its all-India character. Encouraging fissiparous tendencies and talking of all-India character look like blowing hot and cold in the same breath.

7. **The History of the University Misrepresented and Facts Twisted**

It is regrettable that the history of the Banaras Hindu University has not been correctly reported and reviewed. It is just like a drain inspector's report. Since the foundation of the University by Mahamana Pt. Madan Mohan Malviya the following developments have taken place in the University :—

- (i) The number of colleges has increased from six ~~to~~ ^{to} fourteen, each college having its separate building, staff and equipment.

- (ii) The number of hostels has become double, from six to twelve. Hostel facilities have also greatly improved in the last few years.
- (iii) The number of books in the University Library has increased almost three-fold during the last twenty years.
- (iv) The number of students has greatly increased as a result of increased demand for higher education in the country.
- (v) Simultaneously academic work—teaching and research—has developed both in scope and quality.
- (vi) During this period of growth the number of teachers has only doubled, thus making it incumbent on the individual teacher to undertake heavier work and assume greater responsibility.
- (vii) Roads, sanitation, *etc.*, have also improved.
- (viii) The general tone of discipline is sufficiently high compared with other universities in the country.

8. Dark picture Unrealistic

It is not a mere matter of opinion. Facts will speak for themselves. Had the Committee demanded and were supplied with proper facts, it would have been convinced of the many-sided development of the University we have indicated above. If it had gone round and seen things for itself, many features which have been mentioned would have been easily perceived by it. But the pity is that the members of the Committee did not see things for themselves and whatever facts were provided to them were for supporting the pet thesis of the University officials. The picture of the University drawn by the officials of the University which is accepted *in toto* by the Committee is far from being correct and genuine. For the Committee the main proof of deterioration consists in teachers' participation in elections and committees. But it is well-known that under the present constitution teachers can participate in practically none of the elections and they are appointed rarely on administrative committees. Another objectionable feature according to the Committee is some sort of ferment among the students. Without even the least desire to justify indiscipline, wherever it exists, it may be urged that the present unrest in the youth of the universities is a symptom of awakening, a part of the new social and political consciousness. It is a general phenomenon, not confined to the Banaras Hindu University. In the present democratic set-up of the country the spirit of freedom should be reflected everywhere, universities not excepted, and

there is no justification for being allergic to a healthy manifestation of the spirit of freedom and desire for democratic working of the institutions. It is wrong to suppose that in the Banaras Hindu University there has been any gross abuse of democratic principles. The Committee has produced no evidence in support of its contention.

9. The Main Trouble

The main trouble in the University during the regime of the last two Vice-Chancellors has been that persons like Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyer and Dr. V.S. Jha holding the exalted position of Vice-Chancellor had no training and back-ground of democracy and no experience of democratic administration before assuming Vice-Chancellorship. They had been thorough-going autocrats and bureaucrats. The same is true of some important persons in the Education Ministry and the University Grants Commission who are either not congressmen or only post-independence congressmen. Another trouble in the opinion of the Committee is the presence of local elements in the University administration and services. It is difficult to know on what grounds of constitutional or moral propriety it is regarded undesirable. The generalisations in this connection are all vague and sweeping. They require substantiation before they can be accepted.

10. Forced Departure of Successive Vice-Chancellors from the University—A Malicious Myth

The story of the departure of successive Vice-Chancellors from the University has been distorted and used against the people of Eastern U.P. and Bihar. It is repeated *ad nauseam* by interested persons, specially at the Centre where the people of Eastern U.P. have no chance to explain facts.

(1) To talk of any trouble from persons of Eastern U.P. as such during the regime of *Mahamana Pt. Malviya* was most fantastic. During his time the University was disturbed and practically closed for months together in 1921, 1931 and 1932 owing to national struggle and not on account of any local trouble. There were strikes in the professional colleges—Engineering and Ayurveda—regarding courses and degrees. But Malviyajji never threw the responsibility for this on local people or on teachers of the University. He faced problems squarely without trying to put the blame on this section or that.

(2) It is equally wrong to say that *Dr. S. Radhakrishnan* left the University on account of the people of Eastern U.P. He remained Vice-Chancellor of the University for nine years and renounced office of his own free choice and not because he was opposed

or anything was done which he disliked. It is a fact that when he proposed the name of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerji for Pro-Vice-Chancellorship, some members of the Court proposed the name of Pt. Govind Malviya. The election was postponed and later the name of Dr. Mukerji was withdrawn and Pt. Govind Malviya was elected Pro-Vice-Chancellor, defeating Dr. A. B. Mishra in a straight contest. The Court exercised its choice but there was not the slightest desire on anyone's part to flout Dr. S. Radhakrishnan or to be disrespectful to him. The whole thing took a democratic course but Dr. Radhakrishnan, perhaps, did not want to work with Pt. Govind Malviya for reasons impossible to guess. When Pt. Govind Malviya was elected, he requested Sir S. Radhakrishnan to remain Vice-Chancellor at Banaras. But the latter said, "Either Govind Malviya or myself." We venture to say that this was hardly a reasonable attitude. Moreover, Sir S. Radhakrishnan had an important assignment at Oxford as a Visiting Professor. These were the circumstances in which he resigned after holding office for nine years.

(3) As regards Pt. Amar Nath Jha, he was Chairman of the Public Service Commission, U. P. He was requested by Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant, the then Chief Minister of U. P. to accept the Vice-Chancellorship of the Banaras Hindu University for one year, when Pt. Govind Malviya was the Pro-Vice-Chancellor. On the expiry of that period Pt. Jha returned to his substantive post. It is most unreasonable to say that he had any trouble at the Banaras Hindu University from the teachers or the students who always respected him.

(4) The next Vice-Chancellor was Pt. Govind Malviya. The Court of the Banaras Hindu University elected him twice as the Vice-Chancellor. Even under the new constitution the Executive Council of the University sent his name in the panel for Vice-Chancellorship to the Visitor. But the Central Education Ministry selected Acharya Narendra Dev in preference to Pt. Govind Malviya. Acharya Narendra Dev was the choice of Pt. Nehru and Maulana Azad. The suggestion of local interference against Pt. Govind Malviya rests on perversion of facts which is unfair equally to Pt. Govind Malviya and others.

(5) Acharya Narendra Dev succeeded Pt. Govind Malviya. He was universally respected in the University. Unfortunately his health was shattered. To the disappointment of all he resigned his post and passed away within six months of his retirement. Being a popular leader, he handled the affairs of the University so well that there was no trouble during his regime.

(6) After Acharya Narendra Dev Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyer was appointed by the Central Government as Vice-Chancellor of the

Banaras Hindu University. In spite of his earlier record which was undemocratic and anti-national he received a cordial welcome and willing support at the University. It will be better to quote him in this connection.

Speech of Sir C. P. in the Executive Council Meeting held on April 8, 1956. "I have this consolation that my colleagues of the Executive Council, the Standing Committee of the Academic Council and the Academic Council have given me their confidence in abundance. I think I am correct in saying that from the date I assumed charge as Vice-Chancellor till today there has been no meeting in which there has not been unanimity on any matter. I do not think that there has been a single resolution which I wished to sponsor which was negatived, nor there has been any resolution brought forward by any member which I have not sought to support to the fullest extent possible. To that extent I owe my special thanks to my friends who spoke of my adjustableness. I have sought in these various administrative and educational spheres to take the whole body into confidence."

As regards his departure from the University it will be again proper to quote him:

"Colleagues, while mentioning to the Executive Council the question of my resignation from the office of the Vice-Chancellor of this University I wish to put on record the reasons of my resignation, specially in view of the statements that have appeared in various newspapers. It has been stated in these newspapers that owing to reasons of my health I had to resign from my Vice-Chancellorship. That is not so. Fortunately at present I am enjoying fairly sound health. But my age (76 years) being what it is, and having received a warning last year (Serious Carbuncle), I feel it necessary to conserve my health and energy. For over 35 years I had been collecting materials for writing several books and had no time at my disposal to devote my attention to that work. I expected when I was called upon to be the Vice-Chancellor of the Annamalai University that I would get some time to devote my attention to this work. Even when I came to Banaras as the Vice-Chancellor, it was stated that I will not have much taxing work but I find that was not so. *So it was really the commitment that I had made and also the consideration of my health and impossibility of combining that work with this made me go to the President and request him to relieve me from the Vice-Chancellorship.*"

It is rather strange that the Committee ignored this speech of Dr. Aiyer, though its attention had been drawn to it, and ascribed all sorts of motives and all sorts of reasons to explain his resignation. In case there were "squabbles and recriminations" so widely prevalent among the members of the teaching staff and groups,

sometimes based on political ideologies and sometimes on personal loyalties" one fails to see how they brought about the resignation of the Vice-Chancellor. Nor can blame, under the circumstances, be assigned to any single group. Incidentally it has to be said that the version of the unfortunate rowdiness in the regime of Dr. Aiyer given by the Committee in its report (Para. 7) is not correct. The senior teacher who advised Dr. Aiyer never changed his mind or altered his advice. He was loyally present with the Vice-Chancellor in the meeting and accompanied him to his residence. When the Vice-Chancellor's lodge was surrounded by the students, he and several other senior professors were all the time present arguing with the students and pacifying them. There was no teacher who provoked the students or asked them to continue the demonstration. Any suggestion of this kind is, therefore, not only false but also unjust to the entire community of teachers.

The Last Panel for the Appointment of the Vice-Chancellor. On the departure of Dr. Aiyer the following panel was sent by the Executive Council to the Visitor for appointment of the Vice-Chancellor. The names in the panel are in order of preference on the basis of the number of votes secured by the different candidates.

1. Shri M. C. Bijawat (P. V. C.)	11 votes.
2. Dr. R. S. Tripathi	10 "
3. Shri Gurmukh Nihal Singh	7 "
4. Shri V. S. Jha	6 "

Eastern U. P. and the Appointment of the Present Vice-Chancellor. The Committee, ignoring constitutional propriety, raises an irrelevant issue regarding the name of Dr. R. S. Tripathi. There was morally or constitutionally nothing wrong, if his name was proposed, unless it is taken for granted that teachers of the University are not eligible for Vice-Chancellorship. It is wrong to say that Dr. Tripathi was supported by the Eastern U. P. group alone. There were only two members of Eastern U. P. in the Executive Council when the panel was proposed. According to the present constitution of the University out of the five elected members of the Executive Council all the five can be elected from outside U. P., but not more than two from U. P. (Vide Statute 17 (ix) of B. H. U. 1951). It seems that the Committee again relied entirely on some of the witnesses who appeared before them and never looked into the constitutional and real position of the Executive Council. The insinuation that Dr. V. S. Jha is being opposed, because Dr. R. S. Tripathi's supporters feel frustrated reveals the complex from which the present Vice-Chancellor suffers and prompted by which he has been poisoning the minds of people high up in New Dehi. It also explains the

persecution of a certain section which has been going on and which, there is every reason to fear, is likely to mount up. The present Vice-Chancellor assisted by the Minister of Education, the Chairman of the University Grants Commission, and certain other highly influential persons wants to annihilate those who for one reason or another wished that Dr. R. S. Tripathi should be Vice-Chancellor. One of these reasons which appealed to many was that senior teachers of the University should have a chance to work as Vice-Chancellor. It was a matter of principle and nothing personal and yet the report unfortunately represents it as otherwise.

The Present Vice-Chancellor and the Education Ministry. Why Dr. V. S. Jha got the least number of votes is explained by the speech of Dr. Aiyer in the Executive Council meeting on April 8, 1956 at the time of proposing the panel.

Speech of Sir C. P. Aiyer. "Very soon after I sent my letter to the Visitor I had contact with the President of India, who is the Visitor of this University and with the Ministry of Education and I feel that I ought to take this house in confidence when I mention that *the persons connected with the Ministry suggested the name of Dr. V. S. Jha as the person who may be selected as the Vice-Chancellor.* It so happens that *I have never met the gentleman before and I have never known him.* So I have absolutely no knowledge of what is the back-ground of the nomination of Dr. V. S. Jha, but I may mention that the persons in the Ministry of Education seem to be very highly impressed by him and consider that he is very suitable."

Harassment of Eastern U. P. Because Dr. Jha was little known in academic and public life, he got the least number of votes. The Education Ministry perhaps felt offended but managed the appointment of Dr. Jha all the same. Dr. Jha came hostile to the so-called Eastern U. P. group and since then he has been harassing the people of that area. This fact is borne out by a number of enquiry committees he has appointed against members of the staff belonging to this area (Vide Appendix No. 1). Our only sorrow is that this fact has been completely ignored by the Mudaliar Committee. Dr. Jha has made it a permanent policy to twist and pervert every event in the University to the discredit of the people of Eastern U. P. In order to hide his own deficiency he wants to make a scape-goat of the people of Eastern U. P. and Western Bihar.

The Myth of the Departure of the Successive Vice-Chancellors has been used as a political weapon. At the Centre the Finance Ministry has experienced frequent and fast changes. But no insinuation is made. It all depends upon the circumstances and persons who hold offices. The entire matter must be analysed and considered impartially instead of blaming

persons. A word might also be said about the way in which the Ministry of Education pushed Dr. V. S. Jha's name. It was nothing short of infringement of the University autonomy and the Constitution of the University was simply turned into a farce. What was the point in asking the Executive Council to send a panel, when Dr. V. S. Jha's appointment was a predetermined fact? It is strange that the Mudaliar Committee had nothing to say on this point.

The So-Called Loss of All-India and Residential Character of the Banaras Hindu University. The Committee has come to the conclusion that due to the predominance of the Eastern U. P. group the University (1) has lost its All-India character and (2) it has ceased to be a residential University.

The Committee has explained "All-India Character" by saying that the teachers and the students of the University should be drawn from various States of India. It may be humbly urged that the Banaras Hindu University has been an All-India institution ever since 1916, long before the present Education Ministry had anything to do with it. Its portals were opened to all from different provinces of India on the basis of nationalism and patriotism.

The Number and Percentage of Teachers in Various Colleges. A decade ago the staff of the University was 90 per cent from outside U. P. Even today about 60 per cent of it is from outside U. P. At the same time teachers from Eastern U. P. having a population of three crores are not more than 15 per cent; the percentage for teachers coming from Western U. P. being higher (Appendices Nos. 2(a) and 2(b) from the details of the Establishment Budget of the Banaras Hindu University for the year 1957-58). It may be compared with the percentage of teachers and students belonging to the Home State and outside at *Shantiniketan, Shibpur College of Engineering, Kharagpur Institute of Technology, Muslim University, Aligarh, Delhi University and National Institutes and Laboratories in the Country*. The geographical position of the Banaras Hindu University has been ignored in this controversy. Formerly the number of teachers from Eastern U. P. in the University was negligible. Now there are a few teachers seeking their place in the academic life of the country. It is a pity that instead of appreciating this position it is being resented.

The Number and Percentage of Students from U. P. and Outside. As regards the selection of students from the various states of India, in all the Technological Colleges there is a quota system applied invariably. As regards Humanities and other courses admissions are freely opened to all states, but the number of students from distant states joining these courses is not

very large. It is, however, not due to any hostility of men from Eastern U. P., but due to the fact that the Arts students are locally absorbed in a larger number. And yet the number of outside students in the Banaras Hindu University is much larger than in other all-India institutions (Appendix 3). The poor students of Eastern U. P. and Bihar flock to the University in larger number than those from other states. But this is due to the geographical position of the Banaras Hindu University and not to any conspiracy. It should be further noted that the Teachers' Training College, Ayurveda College and School Sections are substantially financed by the U. P. Government. The Law College where local students abound, is financially an asset to the University.

Residential Character. The residential character of the University is impaired not by the people of Eastern U. P., but by the policy of according cheap affiliation to private colleges. Moreover sufficient money is not spent on the construction of hostels. A large part of the finances is spent on general administration, repairs, etc. The campus of the Banaras Hindu University has still room for double the number of existing hostels and quarters. In the Banaras Hindu University admissions rose in many Faculties in the regime of Acharya Narendra Dev. There was some reduction in the time of Dr. Aiyer and numbers were sought to be drastically curtailed last year. There was consequently agitation leading to a strike. The authorities instead of trying to explore the real reason for the strike have all the time been trying to fasten the blame on the teachers. Mr. C. D. Deshmukh, Chairman of the University Grants Commission, went out of his way to cast aspersions on the teachers of the University in his Delhi Convocation address. The Mudaliar Committee criticises the Teachers' Association for having written to him requesting him either to substantiate his allegations or to withdraw them. The allegations have not been substantiated so far.

Personal Contact. So far as personal contact and standard of education are concerned, they depend upon the emphasis laid on academic matters by the University authorities. They want to have personal contact with the students, but dislike the same between the teachers and taught for political reasons. Strike and agitation by students can never be defended in educational institutions. They are, however, a by-product of political and social conflicts in the country. It is absolutely unfair to blame teachers whose position is unenviable, because on the one hand they have to carry out the behests of the authorities and on the other to educate, help and guide the students in a sympathetic manner. The students

are organised as a class. There are youth movements all over the country with which they have contacts. The problems of admission of students and allied problems of their residence and amenities have to be tackled sympathetically and tactfully.

11. Standards of Admission

The standards of admission or education in a country cannot be fixed rigidly or in abstraction. There are different layers of population in the country from the cultural, educational and economic points of view. There are differences of urban and rural areas, between the privileged and unprivileged classes, between advanced and backward sections. The standards have to take into account all these factors together with the general backwardness of the country as a whole. The remarks in the Report about the employees of the University are rather uncharitable. Standards are fixed by competent authorities in the University and minimum qualifying marks for admissions are prescribed. The children of the employees are admitted only when they have qualifying marks. It is for selections alone that concessions are made. It will be really hard if the employees of the University are compelled to send their children outside for education which they can hardly afford. In many institutions and departments of the Government consideration is shown to the children of the employees in the matter of education and recruitment. Why should the Committee then grudge the weightage of 5% or at the most 10% allowed to the children of University employees ?

12. Affiliation

In view of the fact that the Banaras Hindu University is primarily a residential University the question of affiliation is very important. According to the original Act of the University it "could found and maintain other Colleges than the Central Hindu College and institutions including High School within a radius of 15 miles from the main temple of the University for the purposes of carrying out instruction and research." There was provision only for founding and maintaining institutions by the University itself if resources permitted. But the new Act of 1951 (Statutes 26C page 44) made specific and wide provisions for affiliating local Colleges maintained by private agencies. This is really against the spirit of a residential University.

13. The number of Students and Facilities

It is really necessary and exceedingly desirable to provide amenities mentioned in paragraph No. 13. If however it is argued that the number should be curtailed, many people would feel strongly inclined to differ. The remedy is to increase the facilities and

not to curtail the numbers. More funds should be forthcoming from the Central and the State Governments and these funds should not be squandered on administration and office maintenance, but should be utilized for providing more amenities. At present there is excessive expenditure on the administration.

14. Unfortunate Reference to poor students of East U. P. and Bihar

This paragraph of the Report contains a very unfortunate reference to students and particularly the poor students of Eastern U. P. and Bihar. Their presence at the University is regarded by the Committee at once as a problem and a menace. It is a fact that some of the students coming from these areas are poor but on that account they should not be denied opportunities of higher education at a Central University. Pt. Malviya never regarded poverty as a disqualification and it should not be treated as such now. The insinuation that these poor students become a source of disturbance is like adding insult to injury. In fact most of them are simple young men who carry on their shoulders the burden of difficulty and have hardly time and energy left for mischief. The city of Banaras is not so big as to be an improper place for the residence of students and location of a university. There are bigger cities in India containing a larger student population. Nor is the entire population of Banaras a fleeting one. The city has a permanent population of over three lacs and the pilgrims who come have neither anything to do with the University nor do they present any problem, so far as it is concerned. One wonders why the Committee has cited the queer opinion that the University should not have been located at Banaras. There were many reasons why Mahamana Pt. Malviya's choice fell on Banaras. It is an ancient seat of learning, a sacred city, and also a cosmopolitan city.

15. Unauthorised Increased Admissions : A False Charge

- (i) The statement is erroneous. The Principals have no freedom regarding the number of admissions in the Colleges. Every year in the month of April or May, long before the University re-opens in July, the number and the mode of admissions are decided by the Standing Committee of the Academic Council under the Chairmanship of the Vice-Chancellor. The allegation that a certain Principal admitted double the prescribed number cannot be verified, since it is indefinite. In the time of Acharya Narendra Dev the number of admissions rose considerably in non-technical Colleges. It was not on account of the Principals however, but

owing to the Vice-Chancellor's nationalistic and generous outlook. He was anxious to provide educational facilities for the largest number possible. Why blame the Principals then ?

- (ii) The stay of a particular student in the University will depend upon his career and the various courses offered by him. Some of the students are political sufferers who had to break their studies.

16. Teachers' Responsibility for Indiscipline : A Stock Charge.

(1) The allegation that "several of the acts of indiscipline among students have been due directly or indirectly to the manner in which certain teachers have played the role in regard to the activities of the student population", is really unfortunate and based upon the memoranda of interested persons and the University authorities, who are not prepared to understand and face the new student problems. As a matter of fact with undue emphasis on the administrative aspect of education, the status and influence of the teachers in the University have declined. Now the students meet the University authorities directly who entertain them sumptuously and attend to their advice and pressure more than to the requests and appeals of the teachers. This fact can be easily verified in the Banaras Hindu University. The assertion that the Committee had the names of some teachers whose association led to indiscipline is a very serious allegation which should have been thoroughly investigated by the Committee before it gave its findings. Teachers have to associate with students in academic, social and humanitarian activities. This is inevitable. Those who are suspicious by nature or on purpose can always misinterpret such association. Did the Committee really find that the persons whose names were given to them in this connection really fomented or encouraged indiscipline ? In such an important matter allegations or insinuations alone are not enough and positive evidence is absolutely necessary. The Committee should not have incorporated these remarks without sifting the whole evidence. Those who are thus grossly suspected should at least have been given a chance of justifying themselves. Unluckily ex-parte judgment has been passed on them by the Committee. It is a matter of common knowledge that present and previous Presidents of the Students' Union have been won over by the University authorities and used against certain Principals in College Strikes. In the strike, which took place in the College of Technology, students were used by the University authorities. The Mudaliar Committee has completely over-looked these facts.

So far as the teachers of Eastern U. P. are concerned, they have been systematically removed from all positions where students

are concerned, e.g., Chief Proctorship, Proctorship, Provostship, University Sports Committee, Students' Welfare Fund Committee, Parliament and Union, etc. Where is the scope for the teachers of Eastern U. P. for contacting and inciting students? The entire allegation is based on false data. The persons in charge of Students' Organisations are the following:—

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Chief Proctor | Prof. S. C. Das Gupta (Bengal)
helped by a large number of
Proctors, none of whom is
from Eastern U. P. |
| 2. Provost | Principal M. Sengupta (Bengal) |
| 3. Speaker of the Parliament | Dr. A. K. Dasgupta (Bengal) |
| 4. Chairman of the Students Welfare Committee | Principal M. Sengupta (Bengal) |
| 5. Chairman of the Athletic Association | Mr. M. C. Bijawat, P. V. C.
(Ajmer) |

Mainly the above-mentioned persons are in charge of students, discipline and they have the opportunities to contact and influence students.

(ii) Concentration of Power in the Hands of Principals

The theory that recently there has been a concentration of power in the hands of the Principals is not founded in facts. The duties and functions of the Principals are;

- (1) Admissions in the Colleges.
- (2) College Examinations.
- (3) Forwarding salary-bills.
- (4) Granting casual leave and forwarding applications for other types of leave.
- (5) Co-ordination of time-table and allocation of rooms to various subjects, and
- (6) General supervision.

All these functions are performed under Statutes and Ordinances in collaboration and consultation with statutory College Committees, Admissions Committees and many other Committees appointed by the Standing Committee and the Vice-Chancellor from time to time. It is wrong to think that the Principals were anxious to become Chief Wardens. But when Dr. Aiyer wanted them to assume charge of the hostels, his order had to be obeyed.

Dr. Aiyer had an ambitious scheme of tutorials and seminars to be started in the hostels and wanted to co-ordinate these with the work in the Colleges. It is easily possible for the authorities to change the arrangement and there need not be so much fuss about it.

The alleged fact that the Principals indulge in group politics is wrong, as they come from different provinces of India, and have no common regional interests. Likewise, the view that the Principals use students and teachers of their Colleges for unwholesome ends is without any basis. In fact within the last two years there have been instances of strike by students against the Principals and whenever the authorities so desire they can use the teachers of a College against the Principal. There are instances of this kind. How can it be said then that the Principals have an absolute control over students and teachers whom they use for nefarious purposes. The fact of the matter is that so long as Principals were entirely from outside U. P., Principalship was deemed innocuous. But since now there are Principals from U.P. and two Principals from East U.P., all sorts of vices are being associated with principalship: [Appendix No. 2(b)]

17. Constitution of the Selection Committee and Appointment of Teachers.

The real statutory position regarding the Selection Committee and appointment of teachers is as follows (Statutes No. 29):—

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, Chairman. He has the power to withhold any decision if necessary.
- (ii) The Pro-Vice-Chancellor.
 - (iii) A nominee of the Visitor.
 - (iv) Two or three experts recommended by the Standing Committee of the Academic Council and appointed by the Executive Council.
 - (v) Dean of the Faculty concerned.
 - (vi) Head of the Department concerned, ex officio.
 - (vii) Principal, by invitation, having no power to vote.
 - (viii) Registrar, Secretary and Convener.

N.B. The decision of the Selection Committee is mandatory.

It really passes comprehension as to how anything can happen in the Selection Committee against the wishes of the Vice-Chancellor. If any irregularity is possible, it is due to the Vice-Chancellor when he puts aside the procedure and uses his prerogative in the wrong way. The Principal has the power to suggest

a panel of experts and draft advertisement in consultation with the Head of the Department, unless the Head himself is a candidate or likely to be a candidate. But the panel and the draft advertisement sent by the Principal are subject to the approval of the Standing Committee and the Vice-Chancellor. (Appendix No. 6 will show that the allegation that teachers are appointed from one area, particularly from East U.P. is absolutely false. Likewise if the list of experts appointed during the last three years is examined, it will be found that they were eminent persons drawn from all over India). The purpose of these allegations is to discredit the Principals and to place the power of appointing experts and drafting the advertisement in the Vice-Chancellor's hands.

18. A List of Relationships

Unreliable and Malicious Documents Used by the Committee. The memorandum alleging that one of the dominant groups (that of Eastern U.P.) influences the appointments is absolutely false, because Selection Committees are formed in such a manner that no one group can determine or influence their composition. The list of inter-related persons, who are supposed to influence the appointments, in one of the statements sent to the Committee given in Appendix 3 of the report has a false basis and is full of factual errors. Half of the persons are not related at all. Some of the relations mentioned are pure concoctions, e.g., Dr. R. S. Ojha is the son-in-law of Pt. K. D. Tiwari and Dr. Hazari Prasad is related to a number of persons. The name of Justice Balram Upadhyaya has been unnecessarily dragged in. His relative Pt. Sita Ram Tripathi was appointed twenty years ago in the University while he got related to Justice Upadhyaya only last year. However, none of the persons mentioned in the list can influence any Selection Committee in any manner under the present Statutes of the University (Appendix No.7).

Other Relationships Ignored. The Committee did not consider the cases of other relationships of important University authorities and teachers (Vide Appendix No. 8). The present Vice-Chancellor alone has more than a dozen relatives in the University. Before the Committee decided to publish its Appendix No. 3, it was its duty to check these cases of relationships also. We refrain from drawing any inference from these relationships.

It is really very strange to find that the Committee casts aspersions on persons who had a humble beginning in the University, but rose to higher positions due to their labour and attainments. This is permissible in every department of life.

The allegation that recently teachers have been appointed from one single geographical area (Eastern U.P.) is false (Vide list of recently appointed teachers in the University, Appendix No. 6.)

19. Examinations and Examinerships

What is true about Selection Committees and appointments is equally true about Examinations and Examinerships. Under the present Constitution of the University all the Departments have their independent Boards of Examiners which suggest the panel of examiners for approval by the Standing Committee of the Academic Council and the Executive Council. No teacher, including the Head of a Department and the Principal, who has one of his relations as an examinee can act as examiner nor can he suggest a panel of examiners for a thesis. Some very old and rare cases have been cited by the Committee. But we cannot make a sweeping generalisation on the basis of these stray cases.

The case of an unfortunate teacher who insisted on guiding his own daughter is not morally or constitutionally exceptionable. He would have been wrong only if he insisted on being an examiner of her thesis or wanted to suggest the panel of examiners for the same. The right of parents to guide their children is denied nowhere.

Unfortunately paragraph 19 is full of wild and vague allegations which are likely to create a very wrong impression. On the whole the purity of the examination system has been maintained very well at the Banaras Hindu University. Examiners of theses that are submitted are either eminent Indian scholars or scholars from abroad. In subjects like Sanskrit, Hindi, etc., Indian scholars are bound to figure largely. Cases of corrupt practices are very rare and whenever they are noticed, persons responsible are brought to book. Nothing more can be done. Talk of exchange of examinerships at conferences is nothing peculiar to teachers of this University. It is likely that when teachers from all over India meet at a place, they explore possibilities of finding out suitable examiners for valuing papers in their own subjects and they are not much to be blamed.

20. Strike in the College of Technology

According to the first term of reference the Committee was expected to examine the general state of discipline in the University, keeping in view the recent disturbances in some of the institutions. The Committee has done nothing of the sort. Neither did it investigate the general state of discipline in the fourteen constituent Colleges of the University, nor did it cover the recent disturbances. Really

speaking no College of the University has experienced any problem regarding discipline except the College of Technology and the Ayurvedic College. The recent disturbances were three :—

- (1) Strike in the College of Technology.
- (2) Strike in the Ayurvedic College, and
- (3) General strike in the University regarding the admission of students.

The Committee instead of investigating the causes and circumstances of strikes in these three instances picked up only the College of Technology, perhaps because the Principal of the College belongs to Eastern U.P.

Some students were detained for shortage of attendance. They had some grievances regarding the system of taking attendance. They went on strike. Neither the University authorities nor the Enquiry Committee felt indignant at the conduct of the students. Rather they tried to put the Principal in the wrong. It is queer logic that teachers must be always in the wrong, whether the students go on strike against them or against the University Authorities. Really speaking the attitude of the University authorities towards the strike in the College of Technology broke the morale of the teachers and encouraged the students to stage a bigger strike shortly after. The University authorities sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind.

When the Mudaliar Committee had its sittings in the Nadesar House at Varanasi, the case of the Principal, College of Technology, was pending in the High Court. The Committee made only a passing reference to this matter. The statement put in the mouth of the Principal is incomplete and twisted. The Committee asked nobody at Banaras to verify and sign his statement. The allegation that the Principal refused to certify his statement is wrong. The allegation that the Principal was an examiner and students were frightened on that account is wrong. The Principal had refused on his own account to act as an examiner in Part III Examination of Chemical Engineering, to which section the strikers belonged. The question of intimidation did not arise.

Paragraph 20, particularly that part of it which deals with the Principal's answers to questions put to him by the Committee, is based on gross misconception. The Principal only said that he did not take attendance in extra classes for about four months. He never said that attendance was not taken by other teachers. Nine other teachers were regularly taking attendance and the detention was on the basis of their registers. The Principal went to that class as a stop-gap measure pending the arrival of the teacher who had been appointed to teach in that

period. The Committee has perverted facts and the report gives the impression that for four months there was no roll-call at all and yet the Principal wanted to detain the students. On the contrary, he gave full credit to the students for the period during which he visited their class and engaged them just to help those who were short of attendance. Even then the shortage was not made up and according to rules the Principal was bound to recommend the detention of such students. The error of para 20 persists in paragraph 21. When the students said that there was roll-call in their class, perhaps they meant to say that other teachers were taking attendance. But the Committee interprets their statements differently and feels amused for nothing. If the second batch of students had been tutored, as it is insinuated, it would not have felt confused or discouraged and it is unfair on the part of the Committee to indulge in unwarranted gibes and insinuations of this kind.

22-23. The Responsibility for the Present Deterioration

Paragraphs 22 and 23 should be considered together. Para 22 states the conclusion that the main responsibility for the present deterioration in the University rests on teachers, particularly teacher-politicians. Teachers of Eastern U.P. are singled out for special blame. Para 23 gives the grounds on which the conclusion is based and these grounds should be carefully considered.

(a) The Committee has cited no facts in support of the conclusion which it has stated so emphatically. A conclusion which is offered as one of the central findings should have been based on facts rather than on mere opinions. Unfortunately no positive evidence has been provided and therefore those who have been so radically blamed have a reason to feel aggrieved. Certain facts are given in the appendices to this analysis which will disprove many of the conclusions at which the Committee seems to have arrived.

(b) The first opinion cited is that of Mr. C. D. Deshmukh who came to Banaras, stayed with the Vice-Chancellor for two or three days, met the authorities and their friends and got all his information from them. It is wrong to say that he carried out a thorough enquiry. That could have been said only if he had met persons of all shades of opinion. When some teachers met him as representatives of the Teachers' Association, they found him in a wild temper. He went on talking preposterously about U.P. and the inhabitants of that State. The report refers in this connection to the Teachers' Association. Those who tendered evidence before the Committee on behalf of the Association showed to the members of the Committee the membership list of the Association. If some teachers told the Committee

that they did not want to join the Association, that does not mean much. Everyone is free to be a member or not to be a member and the choice depends on personal reasons. That does not detract from the representative character of the Association. It is a fact that Mr. Deshmukh was requested to withdraw his allegations against teachers or to substantiate them and it is also a fact that Mr. Deshmukh has not yet substantiated the charges. Simply because he is the Chairman of the University Grants Commission and an influential person, it should not be open to him to insult the community of teachers. The Committee is solicitous about Mr. Deshmukh's prestige, but thinks nothing of the honour of teachers. The fact that the memorandum of the Teachers' Association states that there was no emergency justifying the Visitor's Enquiry Committee does not amount to disrespect to the President. Difference of opinion does not mean disrespect. It is clear from the memorandum that no disrespect to the President and no discourtesy to the Enquiry Committee were contemplated.

(c) The second opinion cited in para 23 maintains that the Eastern U.P. group seeks to monopolise power everywhere in the academic and administrative spheres. Facts which have been analysed and given in some of the appendices (Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) to the present analysis will show the percentage of inhabitants of Eastern U.P. in the various bodies of the University and in the teaching and administrative services. If these figures are examined carefully, the opinion quoted by the Committee will be proved to be frivolous.

(d) The third opinion is that of some Senior Professor whose name remains unknown. His contention is that ever since Sir S. Radhakrishnan's time, all Vice-Chancellors have been driven out by the Eastern U. P. Group. We have stated elsewhere the reasons which prompted the different Vice-Chancellors to renounce office. Each one of them had a special reason and to blame any particular section is utter calumny (see pp. 5-7).

(e) Then the Commissioner is quoted as saying that students strikes are fomented by teachers. This is what Mr. Deshmukh also says. And yet no proof is provided. To state suspicions categorically in order to denounce persons may be the bureaucratic way, but it is not the honest and just way. Unfortunately the high government officials of Banaras have been taking a vicious interest in the Banaras Hindu University ever since 1942. At present they have been fraternising with the Vice-Chancellor and supporting him in whatever he says or does. The Vice-Chancellor on the other hand has been degrading his exalted office by dancing attendance at their doors. So whatever the local officials say about the University must be taken with a grain of

salt. Even now they are trying to put down those who have expressed opinions critical of the Mudaliar Committee Report and the Ordinance. At present there is a host of C. I. D. men drafted by the local officials spying about within the University area. This is their way and it is for the Government and Parliament to decide how far it is consistent with decorum and decency. The Committee has quoted all adverse opinions to fix the blame on the "dominant Eastern U.P. group" which wants to snatch power. It seeks to ignore the fact that there is a powerful group which holds power, headed by the Vice-Chancellor and claiming as its members very Senior Professors and influential men in Banaras and outside Banaras. The Committee also forgets the fact that the persons whose opinions have been cited may be disgruntled or frustrated persons. There are Senior Professors who were at one time or another P. V. C. or Registrar and aspired to become Vice-Chancellor, and yet their dreams have been shattered and they have become cynical and sadistic. It may be that persons quoted belong to that category and it is worth considering how far the verdict of these disappointed souls is really honest and fair.

24. Student Welfare Problems

The Committee did not go into the causes of the neglect of students' welfare activities. Investigations into these matters would have exposed the University authorities. The causes of neglect are the following :—

(1) Enormous expenditure on the general administration and Central Office of the University. About one lac of rupees in so many forms is spent on the Vice-Chancellor, fifty thousand on the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, thirty thousand on the Registrar and almost a similar amount on the Honorary Treasurer.

(2) Unnecessary allocation of funds to the P. W. D. which is a sink of the University.

(3) The purchase of unnecessary and useless materials for the University by the Treasurer from certain firms yearly to the tune of several lacs of rupees.

(4) Lack of efficiency on the part of University authorities who are unable to utilize available funds which are refunded every year to the Central Government.

(5) The University authorities are interested in doling out sporadic aids to students, either to gratify them or to use them against teachers, but they will not institute an adequate number of scholarships, increase the number of free studentships, build new hostels and improve messing arrangements.

25. The State of Sanitation

26. Electrification

27. Other Facilities of a Residential University

What is true of students' welfare problems is equally true of these items. The Government of India is giving ample funds to the University. Funds are squandered by University authorities on such items as general administration and the P. W. D.

28. Law and Order

The memorandum about law and order was submitted by Mr. Shiveshwarkar, the son-in-law of Shri V. N. Mehta and a great friend of the present Vice-Chancellor and several other members of his group to suit the purpose of the Vice-Chancellor. While depicting dark picture of University discipline he was motivated by extraneous considerations and he shut his eyes to what has happened at Lucknow, Allahabad, Patna, Ahamdabad, Hydrabad, Calcutta and several other places in India. The Banaras Hindu University is much better than many other centres of learning in this respect. During the British regime the same type of officers were preparing evidence as desired by their masters. These officers have not changed their attitude towards Banaras Hindu University as yet. The Commissioner's statement, moreover, lets the cat out of the bag. It reveals clearly how anxious these local officials are to have a free hand with the University. The Commissioner is full of lament that police-men cannot freely have their way on the University grounds. He does not seem to know that there is a sanctity attaching to a University. Moreover, one might ask him how many murders, dacoities, arsons, *etc.*, have taken place within the University premises during the last forty years or so that the University has been in existence. He has magnified small things to justify official interference.

29. University Authorities and Discipline

As regards the responsibility of the University authorities regarding indiscipline the following points are worth consideration:

(1) They have lowered the position of teachers in the eyes of the students and the public by constant maligning.

(2) They have systematically removed able teachers from positions of contact with the student population and appointed convenient people in their places.

(3) The Proctorial system of the Banaras Hindu University has degenerated into a police department and has failed to exercise any moral influence on the students. The list of Proctors is very interesting.

(4) The present University authorities have succeeded in dividing the students and teachers into groups and factions which is very injurious to the general tone of discipline in the University. For instance, the present Vice-Chancellor has used the previous and the present Presidents of the University Students' Union against the students and teachers of the University. It is a matter of common knowledge and the government can easily verify it.

(5) Gratification of one section of people in the University and intimidation of others have resulted in demoralisation of the entire life of the University.

It is mere repetition to accuse the so-called teacher-politicians of the University. They are easy scapegoats for any evil in the University. It is illogical to go on accusing the teachers on the one hand and at the same time expecting their sincere co-operation in the matter of educational reconstruction. The Committee seems to think that every word of what the Divisional Commissioner said was gospel truth and that is why many faulty judgements have found place in the report.

30. Charge of Immorality

The Divisional Commissioner comes in here once again. Might one ask whether his men who noticed students of the University going to brothels examined the identity cards of these students? Banaras has many Colleges that are not really a part of the University and many undesirable young men loiter about in this city pretending to be University students without being so. Assuming that there were some genuine cases of such undesirable visits, the question would be whether they were so numerous as to justify the sweeping generalization of the Commissioner. We have no intention to justify moral depravity, but sporadic cases can be punished without denunciation of the institution. The vague reference to moral turpitude within the University is a grievous wrong done to teachers and the University. What does the blessed Commissioner mean by it? He should specify what are the cases of moral turpitude? How many of them have been reported and over what period of time? If the Vice-Chancellor really loves the University and thinks he is the custodian of its honour, he should challenge the Commissioner to justify his dirty and sweeping allegation. It is a pity that the Committee has accepted his statement and repeated it in the report without thorough and fair investigation. It is easy to do mischief by defaming a University, but it is the duty of all lovers of the University to defend its

honour from being sullied by scandal-mongers. The greatest disservice has been done to the University by propaganda of this type that the teachers of the University indulge in unnatural offences. There are about six hundred teachers in the University. The alleged case is only one. A young man of thirty was bribed by the University authorities to make this allegation of molestation against a University Professor of nearly sixty years of age, because he tabled some resolutions and was found inconvenient in the University Court by the Vice-Chancellor. When the Professor came to know of this false complaint he filed a suit of defamation, both criminal and civil, in which the Vice-Chancellor is a party. The case is pending in a law court which has not given its decision so far. The Professor concerned was not examined by the Committee. The whole allegation is about something which is supposed to have happened six years earlier and the complaint has been made so late at the instance of the University authorities.

31. A False List of Litigations

The Mudaliar Committee's regret that there is litigation between the University on the one hand, and the teachers, students and politicians on the other, will be shared by all. But it must be pointed out that the Committee has based its inference on wrong data. Of the cases of litigation recorded in appendix 4 of the Report, many are false and fictitious. (See Appendix No. 9). There have never been law cases, for instance, between the University and Dr. R. B. Pandey, Dr. R. S. Ojha, Shri Ganesh Prasad Singh, Shri Uma Shankar Pande, Pt. K. D. Tiwari, Dr. Ram Lochan Singh, etc. It is to be noted that all these persons, whose names have been wrongly included, are from Eastern U. P. or Bihar and one suspects that this false list has been published in order to prove the pet thesis of the Committee that the people of Eastern U. P. and Bihar are all sinners. The Committee has not cared to find why suits are filed against the University. It cannot be merely for pleasure or profit. When flagrant injustice is perpetrated and the Vice-Chancellor and other authorities far from giving any redress exult in their cruelties, there is no other choice left but to go to a law court. That extreme step is taken by compulsion and not by choice. Why not ask those people, who have filed suits, to explain what compelled them to it.

32. College of Technology

This reference to the Principal, College of Technology, whose case is in the High Court, and to the Advocate General's part in the matter suppresses some relevant facts and perverts others. Third year students of the College went on strike, but long after the matter had been settled by the competent authority, the Standing

Committee of the Academic Council, the Vice-Chancellor sprang a surprise by instituting an enquiry into the conduct of the Principal. The Principal felt surprised and appealed for reconsideration by the Executive Council, but the Vice-Chancellor did not place his letter before the Executive Council. Then the Principal met the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor personally and asked them what the allegations and charges were and appealed to them to look into the matter personally rather than have an outsider to sit in judgement. The attitude of the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor was stiff and unhelpful. Then the Principal met Dr. K. L. Shrimali and appealed to him, but he was equally stiff. The Vice-Chancellor had for months, been hostile and malicious towards the Principal. There was no other way left to the Principal to protect his honour and interest, but to go to the High Court. The Committee seems to think that going to the High Court is a positive blemish, whatever the circumstances. But a human approach to the question would show that when a man has no other remedy left, in sheer desperation, he goes to a law court.

Reference to the Advocate General is most regrettable. It is untrue and mischievous to say that he 'voted' with the majority in support of the enquiry by Justice Shinde. He was not present in the meeting. Later he made a fervent appeal to the Vice-Chancellor to investigate the matter in a domestic forum. At a later meeting when the resolution of the enquiry came up for approval, the Advocate General remained neutral. Why should it be deemed improper for him to argue a case against the University? Professionally he is entitled to it and so far as the ethical aspect is concerned, who knows it might be his feeling that the University is persecuting a Professor and the Professor must have proper defence. How undignified it is of the Committee to try by their observations to handicap the Principal by not allowing him to have a good advocate to plead his case. One wonders how members of the Committee could make such irresponsible observations.

33. Improvements Suggested

We have nothing to say in respect of the suggestions for improvement. There is always scope for improvement and such measures should certainly be adopted as are expected to bring about amelioration in the life of the University and in academic standards. But we are not prepared to concede that there is anything radically wrong with the University. It is as it has been and it is as other Universities are. The Committee has done a great disservice to the University by creating a false alarm. It has twisted facts, laid wrong emphasis on facts and misinterpreted them and indulged in sweeping generalisations on the basis of half-truths and falsehood.

The University has more than five hundred teachers and about ten thousand students, the number of the administrative staff too being quite large. The period covered by the report is 20 years. If a few facts of an objectionable type have been pointed out, it does not mean that there is a rot in the University. If a similar enquiry is held in the affairs of any other community equally large and the period covered is equally extensive, without doubt some objectionable facts will be discovered in every case. The trouble with the Committee is that not only many facts mentioned by it are wrong, but from the very outset it was prone to put more credence in whatever was said against the University rather than in what was said in favour of it. Mark the epithets. Whosoever has tendered adverse evidence has invariably been described as wise, or honourable or reliable, but others have been referred to with contemptuous indifference.

34. Sarcastic reference to Padmabhushana and the President

The manner in which reference has been made to this case is deplorable indeed. The police wanted to start a case against him. But the case was so weak that it was dropped. The Professor was awarded Padma Bhushana by the President in recognition of his vast learning and invaluable contribution to Philosophy. The fling against the President is very indecent.

35. Summary

This paragraph sums up the findings of the Committee. (1) It is said that the University has lost its all-India character. It is not a fact. Technical Colleges seats are reserved for various States. In the Science College the percentage of students coming from outside U. P. is high and in other colleges too this percentage is not negligible. In no college, whether it is the Arts College, Ayurvedic College, College of Indology, or Sanskrit College, is there any restriction in theory or practice on the admission of students from all over the country. If more students do not come from other states, the reason is that they have arrangements for education nearer home. Let them come and they will be admitted to the University. There is no hindrance. (2) It is a fact that existing hostel facilities are not adequate. There should be more hostels so that all students can live on the campus. (3) The allegations of intrigue, nepotism and corruption made in such a sweeping manner are wrong. To say that the law of the land does not operate in the University is false. This opinion is perhaps based on what the local government officials have said. It is to be remembered that they have always made baseless allegations and raised a false alarm, so that they may be allowed to interfere with life in the University. For instance in 1942

the local officials and the C.I.D. created panic by saying that within the University there were arsenals and ammunition dumps, with the result that the University was under the control of the officials and the Police and it was Pt. Malviya and Dr. S. Radhakrishnan who with great difficulty redeemed the freedom and the honour of the University. The evidence of the Collector, the Commissioner and the Govt. Advocate must be taken with reservation. They are interested persons and the Vice-Chancellor, who has been dancing attendance at their doors, has been able to win them round to his side. These officials talk of corruption. Let a secret enquiry be made and it will be discovered what their own private lives are. Yet they talk like pious souls and denounce the entire teacher and student community.

36. Suggestions

The suggestions are really good and should be put into effect. The improvements suggested have been neglected so far by the University management. Not that money was lacking, but the necessary will and purpose were wanting.

37. Principalships and Chief Wardenships

The question of Chief Wardenship is purely a matter of administrative convenience. It is for the University to decide whether Principals should be Chief Wardens or not. So far as the occupation of some quarters by members of the staff after retirement is concerned, there have been only one or two stray cases of this type, and both the emphasis laid by the Committee and the generalisation made by it are misplaced. There is a tendency throughout on the part of the Committee to make much of stray and individual cases.

So far as the verdict of the Government official is concerned, it is a concoction of some morbid imagination. What is really meant by moral turpitude here in this case is not clear. But any suggestion that moral turpitude is widely rampant within the University area is a lie which is much to be resented.

38. Principals in general vs Dr. V. S. Jha

The Committee is very severe on Principals, not because they are really so bad as they have been represented to be, but because the present Vice-Chancellor has taken very unkindly to some of them. One of the principals, Dr. R. S. Tripathi, was nominated on the panel sent by the Executive Council to the Visitor for the appointment of Vice-Chancellor. Dr. R. S. Tripathi secured more votes than Dr. V. S. Jha and some of the Principals supported the claims of Dr. R.S. Tripathi, since they felt that he was an able candidate

and that there should be a convention of choosing Vice-Chancellors from among the Senior members of the staff, if they were qualified for the job. Unfortunately Dr. V. S. Jha has developed a feeling of rivalry and hostility against these Principals. What is more unfortunate is that the Committee has taken its clue from the Vice-Chancellor and his friends. The reference to the Principal of College of Technology could have been avoided, since it is a matter which is *sub judice*. We do not want to discuss the matter for these reasons, but it must be asserted that both the facts and the interpretation offered by the Committee are incorrect and tendentious. They might even vitiate the enquiry and the case in the High Court.

39. Admissions and Eastern U. P.

The matter of admissions is a ticklish one and it is not fair of the Committee to suggest that it concerns Eastern U. P. or U. P. alone. Geographically the University happens to be located in Eastern U. P. and therefore it is inevitable that students from these areas should seek admission. The reference to the intentions of the Founder is incorrect. He dreamt of at least ten thousand students in the University and he used to say that he would really be a Kulpati, when there were at least ten thousand students. He took special care of poor students and helped them generously. But the Committee is, it seems, of a different conviction. It wants to limit admissions, eliminate students from U. P. and Bihar and refuse admissions to poor students. All this is against the aims and ideals of the University and its Founder.

40. Causes of Agitation

We do not accept the suggestion that there is more indiscipline in the Banaras Hindu University than elsewhere. The Committee has ignored happenings in other Universities of India in the last few years. Nor can we say that past traditions and outside Political influences have nothing to do with agitations in the University. It is surprising how the Committee could ignore these obvious facts. The Committee did not probe into the socio-economic and educational problems which lead to strikes and agitations in educational institutions.

41. The Load of work

There is much confusion of thought and issues in this paragraph. The load of work should depend both on quality and quantity. A teacher doing post-graduate work and guiding research should be relieved of the pressure of inferior type of work. Naturally the junior teachers put in a greater amount of work. There is no harm, if the load of work is determined and enforced in a rational manner. But later in the paragraph there is talk of

exploitation etc. which does not have much meaning. One significant fact is that the load of work should consist of teaching and seminars. In the Banaras Hindu University it is teaching work mostly teachers have to do and, therefore, the total number of periods cannot be very large.

42-45. Procedure to be adopted for consideration: Most Unusual

The Course of Natural Justice disregarded. Paragraphs 42 to 45 lay down the procedure of change to be adopted and in fact this procedure has already been adopted by the Government and an Ordinance has been promulgated. The Ordinance does not depart from these suggestions on the side of leniency, but is on the contrary more rigid and stringent than was contemplated by the report. Section 5 (4) of the University Act has been so interpreted as to eliminate the most natural and equitable interpretation. Consequently, straightaway the Ordinance has been issued without referring the matter to the Executive Council. The reason given for this unusual step is that some members of the Executive Council might have made severe criticism and things might not have gone smoothly. It is an open secret, however, that the official bloc headed by the Vice-Chancellor had always an absolute majority in the Council and the so-called opposition could never muster more than five or six votes including two from Eastern U. P. in a body consisting of twenty-one members (see Appendix No. 4). For example, when the Vice-Chancellor wanted to get himself appointed representative of the University on the Mudaliar Committee, he could easily have his will, with the result that he was always present at the meetings of the Committee and those who wanted to criticise the present administration found it difficult to do so. And those who were bold enough to do so, are being persecuted. Thus the Committee's dread of the Executive Council and the whole short-circuiting of section 5(4) of the University Act are highly unreasonable.

Ordinance and a Small Group of Eastern U. P. Fallacy. The extraordinary procedure and the severe step suggested by the Committee are based on a fallacy. In para 45 it is admitted that there is a large body of teachers doing their work properly and maintaining high academic standards and some sort of compliment is paid to such teachers. Then it is said that only a small group is responsible for the deterioration in the University. Obviously then a false alarm has been created, facts have been exaggerated, and in order to make that small group the target, the whole University has been defamed and hit. But the fact remains and is admitted that the group was small and never in a majority in the Council. The Vice-Chancellor could always have his will and therefore whatever lapses there are, are not

owing to the small group which was in a minority, but to the majority group headed by the Vice-Chancellor. The fact of the matter is that the authorities have become so intolerant and they are so thoroughly assured of the support of the Ministry of Education that they want to crush and eradicate the minority in order to have a totalitarian regime. Authoritarianism has fast been developing in the University, the days of Mahamana Malviyaji, Dr. Radhakrishnan and Acharya Narendra Deva are gone and the Ministry of Education, headed by Dr. Shrimali and Vice-Chancellor Dr. V. S. Jha, have joined hands to play the tyrant in the University. The sooner this plain fact is realized, the better it will be. The Committee has paid lip service to University autonomy, but it is to be regretted that in a most unjust manner it has given a virtual burial to it, allowing the Ministry of Education and the Vice-Chancellor to have their absolute sway.

No Case of Emergency Justifying an Ordinance. There was hardly any case of emergency justifying an Ordinance. The Mudaliar Committee worked in a leisurely manner from July 1957 to May 1958. It did not seem anxious to submit its report in proper time for being considered by Parliament. Nor was the Ministry of Education anxious for it. The matter could wait till the next session of Parliament and the Committee's recommendation for an immediate Ordinance was meant obviously to by-pass Parliament and later to face it with an accomplished fact. Heavens would not have fallen, if the report had been kept pending for two months more. The Committee's fear that the University would not have reassembled and worked smoothly in July without the Ordinance was, to say the least, baseless. The Ordinance, moreover, is wider and more punitive in scope than the emergency might have demanded and thus its constitutional propriety is doubtful.

47. Admissions

Determination of the aggregate number of students to be admitted to the University raises a controversy of a fundamental nature. In the first instance we have to consider the intention of the founder whose ambition it was that there should be at least ten thousand students in this University. Moreover, he was particularly anxious to help poor students. These two facts are part of the tradition of this University coming down from the founder himself. Moreover many people think in a democratic manner and it is their conviction that the University should have an expansionist rather than a contractionist policy and that standards can be maintained in spite of large numbers if the Central and the State governments provide funds and facilities. On the other hand, there is something that can be said in favour of the new policy of restriction of numbers advocated so vehemently

by the Chairman of the U.G.C. Why should some teachers, who happened to voice the former view, be deemed guilty and why should the Committee refer to them in a severe manner? Perhaps to the powers that be it appears an act of temerity to express an opinion different from theirs. But on such controversial matters of fundamental importance at least teachers should be allowed to express their honest opinion and neither Dr. Mudaliar nor Dr. Deshmukh should be so touchy and intolerant.

Wrong aspersions on U. P. Government It is an erroneous notion that the State Government is not doing enough for the spread of higher education in Eastern U.P. Not only is there a University at Gorakhpur, but every district has at least one or two degree colleges, if not more. But is the Committee justified in singling out students of Eastern U. P. and suggesting ways and means to eliminate them. Why not lay down a criterion for admission and whosoever applies and conforms to the prescribed standards may be admitted? The quota in Technical Colleges is fixed. In other colleges naturally local students will come up in larger numbers for admission. It is so everywhere. It is difficult to understand then why the Committee is so much perturbed on account of students from Eastern U. P. and Western Bihar.

48. Ayurvedic College

The Committee's views on the Ayurvedic College are muddled. Instead of recommending that certain basic deficiencies should be removed and thus helping conditions to get stabilized, all sorts of impracticable suggestions have been made. Pt. Malviya started this Ayurvedic College in order to make arrangements for the teaching of Ayurveda in the light of researches made in modern medicine. The buildings of the College are located within the University and so also is Sir Sundarlal Hospital. And yet the Committee suggests that the College should be handed over to the Sanskrit University. This suggestion for a radical dismemberment of the University is queer and shocking indeed.

49. Women's College

The recommendation that the Women's College should be developed better and that it should have a qualified and experienced Principal deserves attention and one can have no difference of opinion in this matter. But the reference to the Founder and the appointment of a Vice-Principal by him is neither generous nor in good taste. We cannot guess now what the reasons were which prompted the Founder to take this step. It may be that he felt that the Principal alone was not able to exercise proper control and carry on the administration satisfactorily. To ensure good

administration he created the post. In the Engineering College also likewise he appointed a Vice-Principal. The Vice-Principal of the Women's College has been there for the last 20 years or more.

51. Constitution of the University Bodies

I. Suspension of the Present Constitution unwarranted.

The Committee has suggested that the provisions of Banaras Hindu University Act Section 5(4) should be waived, that is to say, the normal constitutional procedure of referring the report to the Executive Council of the University for necessary action should be set aside. The Government has accepted the suggestion and an Ordinance suspending the constitution has been promulgated. The main reason for this extraordinary step is that the Executive Council had become dishonest or corrupt or unruly. This change however, is unconvincing. It is hard to believe that all the twenty-one members, elected, nominated and ex-officio, or even a substantial majority of those members had lost conscience and had become oblivious of duty. There were only two members from Eastern U. P. Now it is well-known that the Vice-Chancellor had always a clear majority in the Council and could always enforce his will. The so-called opposition had not more than five or six members and it has yet to be proved that this opposition behaved dishonestly or in an unbecoming manner. (See Appendix 4.) If the Committee and the Government believe that even honest opposition is bad and it must be muzzled at any cost that is a different matter. That is the totalitarian method. It is unfortunate that the Government has steadily been increasing its interference and tightening its grip over the University and the report is a mere ruse to help the government to go a step further on the authoritarian way. The Committee has protested again and again, particularly in this paragraph and in the epilogue to the report, that there are people who do not and cannot agree with their data, inferences and suggestions. It has been presumed by the members of the Committee that all such criticism or difference of opinion is not *bona fide* and that it comes from people who are in a state of terror. This is a very strange logic based on malicious presumption. No criticism, howsoever valid, can be possible if this ground is accepted and it is acknowledged that members of the Committee and they alone can be honest and good and fair and those who differ from them deserve nothing but condemnation.

The Screening Committee : An Instrument of persecution must be dropped. The provision for a screening committee is pernicious. Wherever there is a human institution there may be dereliction of duty and even misdemeanour. No institution is free from this possibility, not even the Government

of India and in ordinary course bad people are brought to book and punished, if necessary. But to forge a standing machinery for the purpose which is to operate at a time when the normal Constitution of the University is suspended smacks of sinister intention. This impression is strengthened, when we compare the suggestions of the Committee in this respect with the provisions of the Ordinance. The Ordinance makes the Vice-Chancellor an ex-officio member of the Screening Committee. This is to say, he will be at the same time the complainant and one of the judges. The third member should be an eminent public man according to the Committee but according to the Ordinance he will be an administrator. The Ordinance does not provide for help from experts. What is worse, the Screening Committee is not nominated by the Visitor, but by the Ministry of Education which has been playing a deplorable role so far as the Banaras Hindu University is concerned. All this shows which way the wind is blowing and what dark times are ahead of the University. University autonomy has become a myth and the sanctity of University life is being violated grossly. What independence of thought and conduct can reasonably be expected of University teachers who are in daily dread of being persecuted? The Mudaliar Committee and the Ministry of Education have done all that they could do to lower the prestige of University teachers and to demoralise them.

52. Revision of the Act: It must go to a Select Committee

There is no harm in appointing an expert body of competent and fair-minded persons to go into the matter of the revision of the Constitution. There are certain features that do need revision. But the suggestion that the object of the revision should be to eliminate some persons or categories is like pre-judging issues. The sole criterion for revision should be the good of the University in the long run and the expert body should not have obsessions such as the Mudaliar Committee had. The revision of the Act must go through a Select Committee which would suggest necessary changes in the present set-up of our republican Constitution.

53. The Visitor:

Does not need further powers. According to the present Act (Section 5) of the University, the President of India is the Visitor of the University. He has the power to annul any proceedings of the University which are not in conformity with the Act, the Statutes and the Ordinances [Act Section 5(7)]. He has also got the power to institute an enquiry into the affairs of the University and issue directions to the Executive Council through the Vice-Chancellor [Sections 5(2-6)]. The Committee suggests that the Visitor should be given the power to suspend the

operation of the University Act under conditions where gross indiscipline, organized strikes or chaotic conditions prevailed'. It is true that the University, or as a matter of fact, any corporate body should function subject to the rules pertaining to peace and order in the country and whenever there is any breach of peace and order, the local administration has the right to deal with the situation. But, to suspend the constitutional working of a corporate body like a University at the instance of the Executive, and, on flimsy pretexts, is unthinkable in a democracy. The stock excuse of indiscipline will be misused by the Executive. We do not know who the eminent persons are who recommended this undemocratic method. Surely they must be old loyalists, autocratic, anti-national people, survivals of the British regime. All powers which *de jure* belong to the Visitor belong *de facto* to the Ministry of Education, and the present experience is that the Ministry does not act properly and it disregards University autonomy and fair-play alike.

54-55. The Court

Suggestions untenable in a Democracy. By suggesting radical changes regarding the composition and powers of the Court, the Committee has struck at the very root of democracy, and the public and corporate nature of the University. Every corporation has its parent body which has legislative and policy-making powers and the executive functions under its general directions. In a democratic scheme the executive is always responsible to its parent body and subject to its power of veto. In accordance with this general principle of the constitution of the country, the Court of the Banaras Hindu University should be the supreme governing body of the university. The Committee resents the interference of the Court in the affairs of the Executive Council but does not make it binding that the Executive Council should behave in a responsible manner. Perhaps on the basis of the inferences drawn from the report of the Committee or at the instance of the Education Ministry, in the Ordinance the Court, "The Supreme Governing Body" of the University, has been reduced to an "Advisory Body" which can give advice on matters forwarded to it by the Executive. Constitutionally this will be an untenable situation according to any democratic or republican standard. It is one thing to revise the method of election in order to ensure equitable representation, but quite a different thing to take away the fundamental powers of the Court. It must be made sure that it does not become irresponsible. But the supreme power of the University must rest in its parent body.

As regards the composition of the Court, the present Court consists of (Statutes 14):

(i) Ex Officio Members

Sub. National Systems Unit,³

National Institute of Educational
Planning and Administration

Do. M. A. New Delhi-110016

G 2074
Date

(ii) Representatives of Departments and Colleges about	40
(iii) Representatives of University Teachers other than Professors	5
(iv) Representatives of Ex-Students	15
(v) Donors	
(vi) Persons representing Learned Professions, Industry and Commerce	
(vii) Representatives of Parliament	5
(viii) Representatives of Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh, Jain Culture and Learning	8
(ix) Members nominated by the Visitor...	5
(x) Members nominated by the Chief Rector	2
(xi) Members nominated by the Chancellor	3

Provided that no employee of the University (teaching or administration) shall be eligible to be a member under any of the items open to election or nomination.

The Committee does not make any detailed suggestions regarding the composition of the Court. The present membership of the Court is quite comprehensive and widely distributed except in the case of representatives of teachers, other than Professors, whose number should be increased. Teachers have no chance of fighting elections. Packing the Court further with nominations and eliminating whatever elections remain, will be really unfortunate in a democratic state like India.

The Court and the U.G.C. Very often reference is made to the University Grants Commission and it is presumed that the control of the University should be in its hand. It is true that the U. G. C. allocates funds to various universities according to their needs and it should be satisfied that the public funds are not misused. But it should not interfere with the fundamental nature and power of Universities in their own spheres and it should not forget that it is distributing public money to public institutions. It is our experience that undue interference by the U. G. C. in the affairs of universities leads to complications and confusion.

56. The Chancellor and the Pro-Chancellor. Ex-Officio appointment not proper

The University, being an autonomous corporate body, established according to an Act of Parliament, should be free to elect its own Chancellor and Pro-Chancellor and up-till now eminent persons have been elected to these high offices.

The present Chancellor of the University is the Maharaja of Gwalior and the Pro-Chancellor is Maharajadhiraj Darbhanga. We do not know on what grounds exceptions have been taken to these elections. At the last election it was Maharaj Kumar Vijayanagaram who proposed these names and they were unanimously accepted. How does then the question of any dominant group influencing the election arise ?

57. Rectors of the University

The present Act (Section 3) provides that the Visitor on his own motion, or on the recommendation of the Court, may appoint such persons, as he may think fit, to be the Rectors of the University. The report wants to take away the power of the Court in this respect also on the basis of the facile presumption that members of the Court are incompetent to advise the Visitor.

58. The appointment of the Vice-Chancellor: Direct appointment by the Education Ministry undesirable

The appointment of the Vice-Chancellor is of a fundamental and vital importance, because he is the executive head, both administrative and academic, of the University and is expected to exercise immense, sometimes unlimited, powers in the affairs of the University. According to the original Act of the University, the Vice-Chancellor was elected by the Court. Sir S. Radhakrishnan was one of the Vice-Chancellors of the University thrice elected to this exalted office by the Court of the Banaras Hindu University, which has become at present the subject of all sorts of irresponsible and unwarranted criticism. When the University Act was amended in 1951, it was proclaimed by the leaders of the country that the changes in the Act would be introduced against the background of democracy and republicanism, which had been accepted by the country as guiding ideals. On the recommendation of the Radhakrishnan Universities Commission, however, the democratic constitution of the Banaras Hindu University became the first casualty. The power of the Court, the parent body regarding the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor, was given to the Executive Council packed with nominated and ex-officio members. Under the present Act it is supposed that the Executive Council sends a panel of at least three names to the Visitor and the Visitor selects one of them for the post. But the fact is that the nominee of the Education Ministry is included in the panel through the outgoing Vice-Chancellor and he alone has a chance to be appointed Vice-Chancellor. The speech of Sir C. P. which he delivered in the meeting of the Executive Council of the Banaras Hindu University on the 8th of April, 1956, is a positive proof (c.f. page 8). Now the Mudaliar Committee suggests that the Vice-Chancellor should be directly

appointed by the Visitor. We have every respect for the Visitor. But what does the Visitor mean here in this context ? It is an open secret that he acts entirely on the advice of the Ministry of Education and therefore it will not be wrong to say that there will be undue governmental interference and infringement of University autonomy. The speech of Sir C. P. is really an eye-opener in this connection. On the one hand it is believed that the members of the Court are incompetent to elect the executive head of the University and on the other that the staff of the Education Ministry, which is much less academic than the University Court by any standard, is deemed omniscient and omnipotent. The Mudaliar Committee forgets one fundamental fact that no superimposed person can command the respect of persons over whom he is expected to rule. Only he can have genuine honour and support, who has the confidence of those whom he has to govern.

The Report fundamentally suffers from group and party-phobia. Sometimes it is afraid of a majority and sometimes of "a vociferous minority" which are the two basic pillars of democracy. It wants to eliminate parties—but not all parties—and groups.

According to the original Act of the University during the imperialistic British regime—the Court of the Banaras Hindu University elected the Vice-Chancellor subject to the approval of the Rector (Viceroy) and subsequently of the Visitor. The persons elected were Sir Shivaswami Aiyer, Pt. Sunder Lal, Madan Mohan Malviya, Sir S. Radhakrishnan, Dr. Amar Nath Jha and Pt. Govind Malviya. None of them suffers in comparison with more recent Vice-Chancellors. This was the choice of the common academic man under an enlightened leadership. Now in the present shape of things, this common academic man is suspected and disliked. The subsequent Vice-Chancellors, under the amended Act of 1951, were appointed as a choice of the Education Ministry. Now the Mudaliar Committee want that the power of appointing the Vice-Chancellor should be invested more directly and completely in the Ministry of Education.

62. The Court : Its powers and composition

In fact paragraph 62 is to be read along with paragraphs 54 and 55. When it is done, it becomes clear that the Committee wants to reduce the powers of the court to the minimum. These powers were already considerably reduced by the new acts and statutes that came into effect seven years ago. Earlier the court was really a powerful body. It elected the Chancellor, the Pro-Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, the Treasurer and practically the whole of the Executive Council, besides sending its representatives to academic bodies such

as the Senate and the Syndicate. The Founder and his great associates had planned the University administration and management on a democratic pattern and wanted not only the Government but also the people to have a voice in its management. If the list of eminent Vice-Chancellors and Pro-Vice-Chancellors and members of the Executive Council who were elected by the Court over a long period, is examined, it will be clearly seen that the old court used its powers in a wise and valid manner in the heyday of its authority. The criticism of the court commenced from the day it elected Pt. Govind Malviya Pro-Vice-Chancellor in preference to Dr. A. B. Misra who was the Vice-Chancellor's candidate. From that time onwards attempt has been made to curtail the powers of the Court. The present Court has no real powers. The members have sometimes criticised the authorities on reasonable grounds. Their speeches have been recorded and one who reads them cannot say that they were frivolous or dishonest. But intolerance of criticism has been steadily increasing and now the Mudaliar Committee suggests that the court should not be the supreme governing body. This suggestion is inconsistent with democratic ideals and has definitely a tinge of authoritarianism. The various recommendations for the composition of the Court made by the Committee are not based so much on a desire to ensure democratic and efficient working as to oust a "certain dominant bloc" which has been throughout a bee in the bonnet of the Committee. The approach to the whole question is not positive but negative, not generous and democratic, but narrow and totalitarian.

Representatives of ex-students. Once all power has been taken away from the Court, there is no point in devising all sorts of means for changing the complexion of elections from this constituency. But no one can have any objection if by some proper method it is so arranged that representatives are elected from all over the country. This is really good and desirable. But any idea of reserving seats state-wise should be ruled out. That will not strengthen the all-India character of the University but on the other hand undermine it.

So far as representatives of donors are concerned they must have seats in the Court. When the University was established, and, for two or three decades afterwards, its growth depended on its generous donors, and now to eliminate them or dissociate them from the University would be ungracious. Though now funds come mostly from the Government, the University even now should welcome donations, nay, invite them. One sad fact is that Vice-Chancellors now do not make an appeal to the people as Pt. Malviya and Dr. Radhakrishnan used to do. The University should not lose touch with the people and should

not deprive itself of the munificence of prospective donors and popular support.

The suggestion that the representatives of the learned professions, industry and commerce should be nominated by the Visitor and not elected by the Court is open to a very serious objection. It is well-known that the Visitor is guided by the Ministry of Education, and in effect, these nominations will be made not by the Visitor but by the Ministry of Education. This governmental interference militates against University autonomy. Such nominations will not be an improvement on the present system, but will impair seriously the status and privileges of the University. In this way the Ministry of Education can pack the Court with persons who will take their clue from it.

Representatives of Parliament should most certainly have a place, but the Committee's observations regarding the representatives of the Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh and Jain faiths are characterised by strange logic. The Committee has, for reasons best known to it, relied too much on the evidence of those who were defeated in the elections and out of sheer frustration have made all sorts of allegations. In all elections those who are defeated suffer from a complex and challenge the correctness and propriety of elections. If their version were always to be accepted no elections would go unchallenged. The suggestion that this constituency should be abolished, since India is now a secular State, does not stand to reason. The University has its own tradition and the representation of Sikhs, Jains and Buddhists has a history behind it. Moreover, the intention of the Founder cannot be disregarded, simply because India has now become a secular State, or because the Government of India is giving plenty of money to the University. After all, in secular State there are classes and religions and nobody can deny the existence of Sikhs, Jains, Buddhists and Hindus.

Nominations to the Court must be limited and they must be of the very best men, not only of persons who can come to check-mate or counterbalance other sections or shades of opinion. The Mudaliar Committee seem to be obsessed with the idea that all those who criticise the authorities in the annual meetings of the Court are necessarily in the wrong, whether they are elected members or teachers. This is a strange approach to the matter. When the Vice-Chancellor and the other authorities become rigid and refuse to listen to very legitimate suggestions of the members, it is natural for members to raise their voice in criticism. The Mudaliar Committee is unfair in so far as it does not examine the conduct of the authorities and finds fault with the members only. To give only one example, year after year the Court has been demanding that the auditor's report should be presented to it for discussion, but the Vice-Chancellor has persistently been evading

it. Very innocent questions and resolutions sent by members of the Court are ruled out *en masse*. And yet the Mudaliar Committee is critical only at the temper of the Court.

63. The Executive Council

The Committee is of the opinion that the Executive Council should be a small body having not more than 15 members. It does not say in what manner these members will be elected or nominated. It, however, seems to suggest that teachers should not be members on it at all. They should be in a small minority. By way of explanation it is said that in the past some teachers or Principal-members of the Executive Council sided with what is called the opposition or the power bloc and did not support the Vice-Chancellor. In the first instance if records are examined it will be found that most of the teacher-members behaved in a most docile manner and voted according to the behests of the Vice-Chancellor even when at least in some cases their own conscience gave them different injunctions. If now and then a Principal or teacher did not see eye to eye with the Vice-Chancellor why should it be regarded as a grave sin? When a man becomes a member of a body he should be conceded the right of expressing himself honestly. And so much fuss should not be made if all the members are not able to ditto the Vice-Chancellor at all times. The Vice-Chancellor should not feel that he is an autocrat but he should arrive at conclusions after full and free discussion of issues.

64. Principalships

It is for those academic experts who are to reorientate the Constitution of the University to decide whether the institution of Principals is to remain or yield place to Deans. This question is to be decided by comparing the advantages and disadvantages of both the arrangements. What appears, however, on reading paragraph No. 64 is that the Committee took into account only objections against Principalship disregarding altogether whatever can be said in its favour. Principals are in fact not so bad as they are made out to be nor can as many evils be attributed to the institution of Principals as have been done by the Committee. Differences and dissension may arise for many reasons and how can we say that only Principals are in the wrong in every case. There are heads who behave unreasonably and therefore the institution of headship cannot be abolished. The remedy lies not in abolishing Principalship but in making proper adjustment and defining clearly the powers of Principals and the Heads. Principalship has historical justification in this University and it leads to continuity of administrative policy in a College over a long period. Of late, some disgruntled Heads

have been agitating against Principalship and the Committee has relied too much on their evidence ignoring the other side of the matter. Principals have been Chief Wardens only for a year or two and it is a matter of administrative detail whether or not in future they should combine Principalship with Chief Wardenship.

65. Grouping of Departments

The grouping of departments under five heads in this para is without any clear logical basis. Moreover, if adopted, the normal work, as it has been going on for several decades, is likely to be dislocated. This drastic reshuffle would lead to no advantage which might justify it. As we have said the grouping is without a convincing basis and the fifth group is really fantastic. It is like Pandora's box, a collection of all odds and ends. Hindi has been grouped along with Sanskrit, Persian, etc., in the third group. That means it will have no place in the Arts Faculty where it should be for the same reason which has led to the inclusion of English in the first group. As a matter of fact all modern languages, Indian or European, should belong to the first group and not to the third group. Is it the intention of the Committee that Arts students should not be able to take up Hindi as a subject or that Hindi should not be used as medium of instruction? It is strange that in the fourth group there is no mention of Chemical Engineering which is at present a promising department. A number of departments like Industrial Chemistry which were abolished long ago are included in the list of subjects.

67. Academic Council

The present Academic Council does not have adequate representation of Lecturers and Readers and this shortcoming should be corrected.

68. Standing Committee of the Academic Council

The suggestion to take away certain powers in academic matters from the Standing Committee in order to hand them over to the Executive Council is deplorable. It is tantamount to encroachment on the academic sphere by the Executive Council which is primarily an administrative body and whose composition is still uncertain. Judging from the present trends and opinions expressed by the Mudaliar Committee the Executive Council will contain in the main non-academicians who will hold office either by nomination or rotation. To hand over the ultimate control of examinations to such a body is against all academic canons and practice prevalent in Universities all over the world.

70 to 72. Advertisements

There can be no difference of opinion about the fact that advertisements should be properly framed and that they should not be framed so as to benefit certain individuals. In this matter it is not only Principals who can depart from the correct course but also Heads. In fact the experts who come are more often friends of the Head rather than of the Principal, since they are teachers of the same subject. The association of the Head, therefore, with the Selection Committee is likely to be more undesirable than the presence of the Principal. There are many cases not only in this University but elsewhere also in which Heads have backed their favourites with the help of experts who happened to be their friends. The experts themselves sometimes go out of their way to back candidates whom they know or who belong to their own institutions. Thus the whole matter is not so simple as the Mudaliar Committee suggests. It passes comprehension, however, why two experts out of these three should always be from outside the State of Uttar Pradesh. Why not have the best men, even though all of them may be from outside U.P. or all of them may be from inside the state of Uttar Pradesh. This suggestion of the Committee clearly reveals a hostile attitude towards U. P. This hostility is expressed at many points in the report. Then one fails to understand why in the present context Dr. S. S. Joshi's case has been brought in. Perhaps the Committee was so keen on vilifying the University that it deemed it fit to insert matter of this type even at an inappropriate place. Before criticising the Principal of the College of Technology in regard to the advertisement, the Mudaliar Committee should have looked into the recommendations of the Visiting Committee and qualifications of the Professor specified in the Model Scheme prepared and approved by the All-India Council for Technical Education, Government of India. They would have then found that the Principal's draft was in order and the other draft which makes even pure Chemistry graduates eligible for appointment as Professor of Pharmaceutics was faulty.

77. Ministerial Staff Association

The Committee has taken a serious view of the fact that a professor was at one time the President of the Ministerial Staff Association and that as such he carried on correspondence on behalf of the Association. It may be urged that on principle there should be no objection to a Professor guiding the affairs of the Association, if members of the Association feel that they stand in need of such guidance. There is the example of Prof. Harold J. Lasky who led and guided the British Labour Movement for a number of years without anybody objecting to it. If the guidance is healthy and does not interfere with the academic work of the Professor he

should be allowed to extend his guiding hand to the Ministerial Staff and the IVth grade staff. If it is not deemed permissible for the Professor to give this help, the risk is that outsiders might step in and that will not be really in the interests of the University.

80. Conclusion

Comments have been offered at the appropriate places on the various specific matters raised in the report, and briefly mentioned in the conclusion. It is necessary to state here, however, that the report suffers from a serious flaw. Its major premise is wrong and therefore the inferences they have drawn from it cannot but be wrong. They had based their arguments throughout on the presumption that things have become fundamentally bad in the Banaras Hindu University and that the main responsibility for the deterioration is that of the teachers. They have singled out what they call the "Eastern U. P. Group" or the "Power bloc" for special attention. They have very often gone out of their way to run down all teachers and more particularly students and teachers of Eastern U.P. and Western Bihar. We want to submit that the affairs of the University, although they may need improvement, are not in such a deplorable state as they are made out to be. Evidence of a special type had been manoeuvred, the presence of the Vice-Chancellor deterred people from expressing frank criticism of the authorities, and fear of persecution prevented many people from telling the truth. Even then we suppose there was ample evidence to prove the responsibility of the Vice-Chancellor and his party for whatsoever evils there may be rampant in the University. The unfortunate fact is that the Committee has not taken into account the second kind of evidence. The Vice-Chancellor has ever since his advent been anxious to create an alarm and punish some persons to whom he has taken unkindly for personal reasons. What is more unfortunate is that he has used his high office for creating an alarm in Delhi. He is lucky in having the unqualified support of the Ministry of Education which was responsible for his appointment. He has poisoned the ears of the Chairman of the U.G.C. without giving him a chance to see the other side of the picture. The result is that there is an uproar against the University and a wrong and pernicious impression has been created by the Mudaliar Committee report. The fair name of the University has been sullied and an opportunity has been furnished to all and sundry to make irresponsible and even malicious criticism.

University autonomy has been totally annulled and the University is now in the hands of the Government. If things had been viewed in a correct perspective and if the intentions of the Vice-Chancellor and the Ministry of Education had been sound and fair,

the present unfortunate developments could have been avoided. All desirable improvements could have been effected within the existing frame-work of the University constitution and without violating University autonomy. If it was felt that the presence of some persons, either teachers or outsiders on some of the University bodies was undesirable, the proper thing to do would have been that the Visitor or the Prime Minister should have sent for these persons and asked them to resign from those bodies. There is not the slightest doubt that every one would have obeyed the Visitor or the Prime Minister and things would have been managed without gross vilification of the University. Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant was a member of the Executive Council of the University for a number of years preceding the present suspension of the Constitution. If he had found it possible to attend some of the meetings or even to spend a few days at Banaras investigating matters and meeting people, things would have been mended. Nobody would have dared to flout his decision and orders. But alas ! nothing of the kind was done. On the contrary the University has been undeservedly defamed and University autonomy is a thing of the past. What is worse, persecution of the University staff, is now in the offing. The Vice-Chancellor is manoeuvring day and night to bring about the discomfiture of those to whom he is opposed and the Ministry of Education is with him in this cruel work. Who can feel sure, for instance, that the Screening Committee will function in an unprejudiced manner when the Vice-Chancellor will always be present to twist facts and present them in a wrong perspective. If it were any other Vice-Chancellor things might have been different. But to expect justice from a partisan and ungenerous Vice-Chancellor like the present one is but a foolish dream.

Epilogue

Nothing reveals the unfair attitude of the Committee as the epilogue does. The protestation of the Committee is nothing but a convenient way of silencing criticism. The presumption in the epilogue, as in the whole of the report, is that whatever is said by the Vice-Chancellor and his friends against the University and its teachers is always right and whatever is said against the authorities and their friends and in favour of the University is always wrong. If that is the attitude of the very eminent and honourable people who compose the Mudaliar Committee, justice is obviously a far cry. We hope that all fair-minded persons will form their judgement, not only on the basis of the Mudaliar Committee Report, but in the light of the other facts and arguments which the Committee has ignored or discarded. It is worthwhile reiterating that the Mudaliar Committee has based its one-sided judgement not on facts but on opinions. Moreover the opinions on which the Committee places premium and bases its decisions

are not impartial ones and are rarely borne out by facts. The whole report is thus faulty and prejudiced. Its publication, therefore, could have been withheld till its contents had been thoroughly examined and verified. We have great respect for the members of the Committee, but are constrained to say that they have done incalculable damage to a great institution by passing a scathing verdict which cannot stand scrutiny.

ANALYSIS OF THE APPENDICES OF THE REPORT

No 1.

This appendix contains the list of persons who were interviewed by the Committee, at Varanasi. The list is a long one. The Committee in the course of its report, made use of the memorandum of only one 'Senior Professor' and does not refer to any other evidence or witness. Besides the teachers and students those examined were old loyalists and Government Officials ; no public man of eminence was examined. The memorandum of the Teachers' Association does not find any place in the Report.

It would have been better if the list contained the names of all persons who were interviewed by the Committee at various places. This could have revealed the nature of the evidence collected by the Committee. But the Report conveniently avoids it.

No. 2.

This appendix contains a comparative chart showing the contributions made by the Central and State (U. P.) Governments to the University. The Committee forgets that the U. P. is included in the Centre also. Moreover, the Report does not contain any column for enormous public donations in land, money and various types of property which made the existence of the University possible. This is deliberately done to eliminate the public sector. The purpose of this appendix is to show that the Centre is making substantial grants to the University and to justify the tightening of control over the University by the Central Government.

No. 3. A false document

This is a malicious and false document. It is calculated to show that these supposedly inter-related persons are responsible for all sorts of corruption in the University. One-third of the list contains the names of persons who are not on the staff, e.g., Nos. 4, 6, 7, 11, 16 and 18. No. 8 is not the son-in-law of No. 7. This is a deliberate malignment and abuse. Except two or three all other relations shown are fictitious. Those few recently related were appointed in the University long ago through the proper channel on the basis of their qualifications.

When the Committee decided to incorporate this list of relationships, in all fairness it should have included other similar lists also. We give below the list of some other inter-related persons which is by no way exhaustive. It will be seen that most of the persons included in the supplementary list wield much more power and influence than persons in the published list. We do not want to draw any inference but desire only to show how absurd is the decision of the Committee to accept the list as correct and publish it. (See Appendices Nos. 7 and 8).

No. 4.

It is a fake document on litigation against the University. Fourteen out of the twenty-three cases do not exist at all. Out of the rest six are twisted. Two are actual cases under abnormal circumstances. (See Appendix No. 9).

Appendices

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF ENQUIRIES INSTITUTED BY DR. V. S. JHA, VICE-CHANCELLOR AGAINST TEACHERS OF EASTERN U. P. AND ALLIED AREAS

1. Dr. Gopal Tripathi, Principal, College of Technology.
(President of Teachers' Association)
2. Dr. Daya Swarup, Principal, College of Mining and
Metallurgy.
3. Dr. Ram Deva Mishra, Head of the Department of
Botony.
4. Dr. Virendra Kumar, Lecturer, Ayurveda College.
5. Dr. V. S. Dubey, Hon. University Professor of Geology.
6. Prof. Radhey Shyam Sharma, College of Technology.
7. Shri Gauri Shankar Tiwari, College of Technology.
8. Dr. Jagadish Sharma, Librarian, B. H. U.

APPENDIX 2(a)

Number and percentage of teachers in the various Colleges of the University

Name of Colleges	Total number of Teachers on Staff	Out side U. P.	West U. P.	East U. P.
1. Engineering ...	75	50	15	10
2. Technology ...	48	38	6	4
3. Mining and Metallurgy	25	15	7	3
4. Agriculture ...	25	15	6	4
5. Science ...	105	75	20	10
6. Central Hindu Coellege	95	55	22	18
7. Indology ...	14	9	1	4
8. Women's College ...	35	24	7	4
9 Teachers' Training ...	18	9	6	3
10. Law College ...	6	3	2	1
11. Music and Fine Arts ...	17	11	4	2
12. Oriental Learning (Samskrit Mahavidalaya) ...	31	15	6	10
13. Ayurveda College ...	31	15	10	6
14. Central Hindu College, Kamachha (Intermediate).	50	30	10	10
Grand Total ...	575	364	122	89
Percentage ...		63.3%	21.2%	15.5%
			36.7%	

APPENDIX 2(b)

LIST OF PRINCIPALS OF THE BANARAS HINDU
UNIVERSITY, VARANASI—5

(Eastern U. P. marked with *. Only two out of fourteen):

Central Hindu College, B. H. U.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|------------|
| (i) Prof. A. B. Dhruva | ... | ... | (Previous) |
| (ii) Prof. K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar | ... | ... | Do. |
| (iii) Dr. U. C. Nag | ... | ... | Do. |
| (iv) Dr. R. S. Tripathi | ... | ... | (Present) |

Central Hindu College, (Kamachha), Varanasi.

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|------------|
| (i) Prof K. P. S. Malani | ... | ... | (Previous) |
| (ii) Dr. D. N. Chakravarty | ... | ... | (Present) |

College of Science.

- | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----|-----|------------|
| (i) Prof. M. B. Rane, Datta. | ... | ... | (Previous) |
| (ii) Prof. (Dr.) S. S. Joshi | ... | ... | (Present) |

Engineering College.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|------------|
| (i) Prof. C. A. King | ... | ... | (Previous) |
| (ii) H. P. Phillipot | ... | ... | Do. |
| (iii) Shri M. Sen Gupta | ... | ... | (Present) |

College of Technology.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|-----|------------|
| (i) Dr. A. N. N. Godgole | ... | ... | (Previous) |
| (ii) Prof. P. S. Verma | ... | ... | Do. |
| (iii) Dr. Gopal Tripathi | ... | ... | Do. |

College of Min. and Metallurgy.

- | | | | |
|------------------------|-----|-----|------------|
| (i) Prof. M. P. Gandhi | ... | ... | (Previous) |
| (ii) Dr. Daya Swarup | ... | ... | (Present) |

College of Agriculture.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|-----|------------|
| (i) Dr. Bhola Nath Singh | ... | ... | (Previous) |
| (ii) Dr. Badami | ... | ... | Do. |
| (iii) Dr. Luthra | ... | ... | Do. |
| (iv) Dr. Jaswant Singh | ... | ... | (Present) |

8. *Law College.*

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|-------------|
| (i) Principal Subramaniam ... | ... | (Previous); |
| (ii) Prof. G. B. Joshi ... | ... | (Present). |
| (iii) Prof. Vyas ... | ... | (Previous). |

9. *Teachers' Training College.*

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|-------------|
| (i) Pt. Lajja Shankar Jha ... | ... | (Previous); |
| (ii) Prof. H. B. Malkani ... | ... | Do. |
| (iii) Dr. P. Razdon ... | ... | (Present). |

10. *College of Indology.*

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|-------------|
| (i) Dr. R. C. Majumdar ... | ... | (Previous); |
| * (ii) Dr. R. B. Pandey ... | ... | (Present). |

11. *College of Oriental Learning.*

- | | | |
|---|-----|-------------|
| (i) Pt. Pramatha Nath Tarka B hushan ... | ... | (Previous). |
| (ii) Pt. Rama Avatar Sharma ... | ... | Do. |
| (iii) Pt. Bal Krishna Misra ... | ... | Do. |
| (iv) Pt. Kali Prasad Misra ... | ... | Do. |
| (v) Pt. Mahadeva Prasad Sastri (Ag.) ... | ... | (Present). |
| (vi) Pt. Ram Vyas Panday ... | ... | ... |
| (vii) Pt. Viswa Nath Prasad Shastri (Ag.) ... | ... | (Present). |

12. *Ayurvedic College.*

- | | | |
|--|-----|--------------|
| (i) Pt. Dharm Das Kaviraj ... | ... | (Previous). |
| (ii) M. S. Verma (Ag.) ... | ... | (Previous) 8 |
| (iii) Pt. Rajeshwar Datt Shastri (Ag.) ... | ... | (Present). |

13. *College of Music and Fine Arts.*

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-------------|
| (i) Pt. Omkar Nath Thakur ... | ... | (Previous). |
| (ii) Km. Prem Lata Sharma (Ag.) ... | ... | (Present). |

14. *Women's College.*

- | | | |
|--|-----|-------------|
| (i) Mrs. K. Adhikari ... | ... | (Previous). |
| (ii) Miss Venkateswaran ... | ... | Do. |
| (iii) Mrs. Jamna Devi Pathak (Ag.) ... | ... | (Present). |

15. *Librarians.*

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-----|-------------|
| (i) Shri Ranganathan ... | ... | (Previous); |
| (ii) Shri D. Subramania ... | ... | Do. |
| (iii) Dr. Jagdish Sharma ... | ... | (Present). |

APPENDIX 3

STATEMENT SHOWING NUMBER OF STUDENTS
IN VARIOUS CONSTITUENT COLLEGES OF
THE BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY

Name of the College	Total number of students	Students from outside U. P.	Students from U. P.
1. College of Music and Fine Arts	193	78 40%	115 60%
2. Ayurvedic College ...	361	117 32.5%	244 67.5%
3. College of Agriculture ...	220	135 61.4%	85 38.6%
4. Engineering College ...	558	360 64.5%	198 35.5%
5. College of Mining and Metallurgy	225	133 59%	92 41%
6. College of Technology ...	480	242 51%	238 49%
7. College of Indology ...	144	48 33.3%	96 66.4%
8. Law College ...	426	56 13%	370 87%
9. Women's College ...	437	88 20%	349 80%
10. College of Science ...	1,038	281 27.1%	757 72.9%
11. Central Hindu College, Kamachha	1,010	459 45.5%	551 54.5%
12. Central Hindu College, (Arts College, B. H. U.)	2,697	492 18.5%	2,205 81.5%

13. Samskrit Mahavidyalaya	416	227 57.5%	189 42.5%
14. Teachers' Training ...	128	10 8%	118 92%

In Faculty of Technology Consisting of Engineering College, College of Mining and Metallurgy, College of Technology and College of Agriculture.	Outside U. P. 58.7% U. P. 41.3%
In Non-Technical Colleges like Arts, Science, Indology, Law, Ayurveda, Women's C. H. C., Kamachha, Samskrit, Teachers' Training, and Music and Fine Arts	Outside U. P. about 30.2% U. P. 70.1%

APPENDIX 4

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
1957-58

[Those from Eastern U. P. are marked with *.]

1. Dr. V. S. Jha, Vice-Chancellor (nominated by Visitor)
2. Prof. M. C. Bijawat, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (nominated by Vice-Chancellor).
3. Shri Jyoti Bhushan Gupta, Treasurer (nominated by Vice-Chancellor).
4. Principal M. Sen Gupta, Provost (nominated by Vice-Chancellor).
5. Prof. S. C. Das Gupta, Chief Proctor (nominated by Vice-Chancellor).
6. Pt. Hridai Nath Kunzru (nominated by Visitor).
7. Pt. Gopinath Kunzru (nominated by Chancellor).
8. Pt. Iqbal Narain Gurtu (nominated by Rector).
9. Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Anand (nominated by Visitor)
10. Principal P. Razdan (Principal—Ex officio).
11. Principal G. B. Joshi (Principal—Ex officio).
12. Principal Leela Sharma, (Vasant Kanya Maha Vidyalaya, affiliated College).
13. Principal P. Telang (Basant College, Rajghat, Affiliated College)
- *14. Dr. Raj Bali Pandey (Principal—Ex officio).†
- *15. Dr. Gopal Tripathi (Principal—Ex officio).†
16. Dr. Jaswant Singh (Principal—Ex officio).
17. Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant, Delhi (Elected).
18. Prof. Nanda Dulare Bajpeyi, Saugar, M. P. (Elected).
19. Prof. Rama Shankar Pandey, Nalanda, Bihar. (Elected.).
20. Pt. K. D. Tewari, Lucknow (Elected).
- *21. Shri Udai Saroj Shah, Banaras (Elected).
22. Shri S. L. Dar, Registrar Secretary.

†Member from December 1957 for a few months only before the Ordinance.

APPENDIX 5

MEMBERS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

1957-58

*[Those from Eastern U.P. are marked with *.]*

1. Dr. V. S. Jha, Vice-Chancellor.
2. Prof. M. C. Bijawat, Pro-Vice-Chancellor.
3. Dr. R. S. Tripathi, Principal, Central Hindu College, B. H. U.
4. Dr. D. N. Chakravarti Principal, Central Hindu College, Kamachha.
5. Principal M. Sen Gupta, Engineering College.
- *6. Dr. Gopal Tripathi, Principal, College of Technology.
7. Dr. Daya Swarup, Principal, College of Mining and Metallurgy.
8. Dr. S. S. Joshi, Principal, Science College.
9. Dr. Jaswant Singh, Principal, Agriculture College.
10. Dr. P. Razdon, Principal, Teachers' Training College.
11. Principal G. B. Joshi, Law College.
- *12. Dr. Raj Bali Pandey, Principal, College of Indology.
13. Pt. Onkar Nath Thakur, College of Music and Fine Arts).
14. Mrs. K. Venkateshwaran, Principal, Women's College.
- *15. Pt. Mahadeva Shastri, Principal, Samskrit Mahavidyalaya.
16. Dr. M. S. Verma, Ag. Principal, Ayurveda College.
17. Dr. M. P. Netarwala, Dean, Faculty of Technology.
18. Dr. Rajnath, Dean, Faculty of Science.
19. Dr. A. K. Das Gupta, Dean, Faculty of Arts.
20. Prof. S. C. Das Gupta, Chief Proctor.

APPENDIX 6

Dr. V. S. Jha took over charge as Vice-Chancellor of Banaras Hindu University on July 3, 1956.

STATEMENT SHOWING APPOINTMENTS MADE DURING
THE REGIME OF DR. V. S. JHA FROM JULY 1956
UP TO DECEMBER 1957.

Executive Council Meeting held on	Total appointments	Outside U.P. appointments	West U.P. appointments	East U.P. appointments
August 5, 1956	12	10	2	nil
August 26, 1956	6	4	1	1
September 30, 1956	9	7	1	1
December 8, 1956	29	19	6	4
February 23, 1957	18	13	3	2
March 24, 1957	4	3	1	nil
April 28, 1957	16	13	nil	3
July 27, 1957	15	10	2	3
September 15, 1957	30	17	7	6
December 8, 1957	52	29	11	12
Grand Total	191	125	34	32
		65.5%	17.8%	16.7%
		(O.U.P.)	(W.U.P.)	(E.U.P.)

APPENDIX 7

B. H. U. Mudaliar Committee Report: Appendix 3 : A Hoax.

APPENDIX 3

List of Members of the Staff who are stated to be inter-related.

N.B. Kindly see the list in the Report on p. 39.

Analysis :

- (1). Nos. 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 16 and 18 are not on the staff of the Banaras Hindu University.
- (2) Relationship between 7 and 8 is absolutely false.
- (3) No. 7 is not related to No. 1 and many others mentioned in the list. Moreover he was never on any Selection Committee for teaching appointments.
- (4) No. 15 is not related to anybody in the list.
- (5) No. 16 has been simply dragged in. No. 17 was appointed fifteen years ago and was related to No. 116 only last year. No. 16 has never been on any Selection Committee.
- (6) Except three or four all the relations are far-fetched and concocted.
- (7) Those who are really employees were appointed through properly constituted Selection Committee long before they were related due to social contacts in the University. These persons belong to an area equal to Kerala or even more.

Conclusions :—

- (1) The intention of the list is to defame these people and accuse them of nepotism.
- (2) The list is stated to be but not verified. But the inference is asserted with great emphasis in the Report..
- (3) Kindly see the real and effective relationships in the *Supplement to Appendix 3*.

APPENDIX 8

B. H. U. Mudaliar Committee Report : Appendix 4 : A Fake Document.

APPENDIX 4 (p. 40)

*List of disputes pending in Courts of Justice with the University as Party.
(Those marked with * have no case)*

1. Dr. Akshaibar Lal, Reader, College of Agriculture.
- *2. Dr. Raj Bali Pandey, College of Indology.
3. Dr. S. S. Joshi, Principal, Science College.
- *4. Botany Deptt., Indian Wheat Loan.
- *5. Sale of old Newspapers and Magazines in the B. H. U. Library.
6. Birendra Nath, Lecturer, College of Ayurveda.
- *7. College of Mining and Metallurgy, Appointments of Readers.
8. Indiscipline in the College of Technology.
- *9. Re. two posts of Lecturer in Hindi.
10. Re. Pt. Ram Vyas Pandeya, Jyotishi, Samskrit College, B. H. U.
- *11. Dr. R. S. Ojha, Reader, English, Central Hindu College.
12. Shri Ganesh Prasad Singh, Lecturer, Teachers' Training College, B. H. U.
- *13. Pt. Dhaneshwar Pandey, Compounder, S. S. Hospital, B. H. U.
- *14. Dr. B. L. Atreya, Head of the Deptt. of Philosophy, B. H. U.
- *15. Shri D. S. Pande, Temporary Medical Officer, S. S. Hospital, B. H. U.
- *16. Shri Uma Shankar Pandey, Art Teacher, Central Hindu School, Banaras.
- *17. Pt. K. D. Tewari, Member, B. H. U. Court, Executive Council and Finance Committee.
- *18. Pt. Kedar Dutt Joshi, Adhyapaka in Jyotish, Samskrit College.
19. Dr. Gopal Tripathi, Principal, College of Technology, B. H. U.

NIEPA DC



D02074

- *20. Dr. Ram Lochan Singh, Head of the Deptt. of Geogrāphy, B. H. U.
- *21. Pt. Ambika Prasad Upadhyaya, Adhyapaka in Viyakaarana, Samskrit College.
22. Dr. S. S. Joshi, Principal, College of Science, B. H. U. .
23. Appointment of Treasurer.

Analysis—The list in the Appendix has been given to support the statement given in the Report (31 p. 13) that the University teachers, twenty-three in number, have gone to the Court off Law against the University and have thus suggested an atmosphere of defiance. Were it true, it is really alarming. But the following analysis will reveal that it is far from it.

(1) Nos. 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 and 21 have no case in the Law Court against the University. It is a fact which can be publicly verified. It is not a matter of opinion. These persons have been unnecessarily dragged in.

(2) Nos. 3 and 14 did not file any suit against the University. They were sued by outsiders and the University was a party by them for which Nos. 3 and 14 were not responsible. This can also be verified.

(3) Nos. 1, 10 and 19 have really gone to the Law Court as they were treated very summarily and unconstitutionally. These are really the cases of persecution, as these people are supposed to be the leaders of the Eastern U. P. Group.

(4) No. 8 is simply a repetition of No. 19.

(5) Nos. 3 and 22 are again pure repetition.

(6) No. 23 is a case filed by an outsider against the Treasurer on constitutional ground.

Conclusion—(i) The Appendix No. 4 betrays a colossal indifference on the part of the Committee regarding the verification of facts. It is given as an important evidence. The report throughout suffers from this vital defect and loses authenticity.

(ii) President is the Fountain of Justice. It is his duty to verify and rectify.

Sub. National Systems Unit,

National Institute of Educational

Planning and Research

17-B, Saket, New Delhi-110016

DCC. No. 2074.....

Date.. 31-12-84.....