

# Proceedings of International Conferences on Philosophy of Education (2013-2017)

## Volume II

*Edited by  
Prakash Iyer*

[https://publications.azimpremjiuniversity.edu.in/2364/1/PoE\\_Conference\\_Proceedings\\_Vol\\_II.pdf](https://publications.azimpremjiuniversity.edu.in/2364/1/PoE_Conference_Proceedings_Vol_II.pdf)

**KNOWLEDGE, POLITICS AND EDUCATION**

# KNOWLEDGE, POLITICS AND EDUCATION

Proceedings of International Conferences  
on Philosophy of Education

(2013 – 2017)

Volume II

*Edited by  
Prakash Iyer*



Azim Premji  
University

CINNAMONTEAL  
DESIGN & PUBLISHING



First published in 2020 by CinnamonTeal Design and Publishing

Copyright © 2020 Azim Premji University, Bengaluru - 560 100, India

ISBN: 978–93–87676–73–2

BISAC: EDU034000/EDUCATION/Educational Policy & Reform/General  
EDU000000/EDUCATION/General  
EDU040000/EDUCATION/Philosophy, Theory & Social Aspects

Azim Premji University applies the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported (CC BY-NC-ND 3.0) to this book and the articles published in this book.

Read the human readable summary (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>) or the full license legal code (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode>) of the applied license.

Under this license, authors retain ownership of the copyright for their content, but allow anyone to download, reuse, reprint, and/or copy the content as long as the original authors and source are cited. No permission is required from the authors or the publishers.

Authors are able to waive the terms of the CC license and enter into separate, additional contractual arrangements for the non-exclusive distribution and subsequent publication of this work (e.g., publish a revised version in a journal, post it to an institutional repository or publish it in a book), with an acknowledgement of its initial presentation at these conferences.

Typesetting and Cover design: CinnamonTeal Design and Publishing

CinnamonTeal Design & Publishing  
Plot No 16, Housing Board Colony  
Gogol, Margao  
Goa 403601 India  
[www.cinnamonteal.in](http://www.cinnamonteal.in)

On behalf of:  
Azim Premji University,  
Pixel A, PES Campus,  
Electronic City,  
Bangalore. 560 100 India  
<https://azimpremjiuniversity.edu.in/>

For printed copies: click [here](#) for Vol I and click [here](#) for Vol II.

# Table of Contents

Introduction 7

## Section I

1. Liberal Education, Human Nature and the State 17

*Anthony O’Hear*

2. Truth, Harmony and Justice 38

*Rohit Dhankar*

3. Academic Knowledge and Democratic politics 53

*Elizabeth Rata*

4. Educational Inequalities and Educational Justice 76

*Krassimir Stojanov*

## Section II

5. Transformative Education for a Just Society 99

*Rudolf Heredia*

6. Unpacking Intersectionality: Conceptual explorations of convergences and divergences of class, caste and gender in Education 136

*Amman Madan*

### Section III

7. Teaching as a Learning Profession 177  
*Milbrey McLaughlin*
8. Teacher's Work and Identity: A Case for Strengthening Knowledge Relations 201  
*Meera Gopi Chandran*
9. Teaching Democracy: Relational Ontology in Feminist and Ambedkarite critique 224  
*Asim Siddiqui*

# Transformative Education for a Just Society

Rudolf C. Heredia

*He taught sociology at St. Xavier's College, Mumbai, where he was the founder director of the Social Science Centre during 1980–1992, and director again in 1994–2003.*

## Education and Social Capital

H.G. Wells presciently concluded his *Outline of History* in 1920 with a warning we need to take to heart seriously: “Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.” (Wells 2004, 1st 1920) The inadequacy of education at all levels is putting our future at enormous risk in the rapid and radical change Indian society is undergoing. It is failing to provide the social capital needed for our society to navigate this transition, that is, the social infrastructure of values and norms, behaviour patterns and interactive networks on which our Constitutional vision of social transformation is premised. Conscientised adult literacy, universal primary education, good secondary education in multiple streams available to all, accessible tertiary education for everyone qualified, with at least some world class institutions at the upper end of this spectrum,... all these are crucial social capital for governments and society to investment in.

Already in the ideological inspiration of the freedom struggle, there is an inherent tension between, on the one hand, an envisioned future that contested colonial rule in terms of a “vision centred on social transformation aimed at giving

justice to the downtrodden,” (Kumar 1998: 10), and on the other, an idealised past that “gave priority to the recovery of Indian self-identity with the help of religious cultural revivalism.” (Kumar: *ibid.*) The dominant Nehruvian consensus of the early independence era was premised on the first, but it never could quite contain or defuse the lure of the second.

### **Transmission and Transformation**

For the sociologist, Emile Durkheim education is “the means by which society perpetually re-creates the conditions of its very existence” by “a systematic socialisation of the young generation.” (Durkheim 1956: 123 -124) This implies two basic functions for education. Firstly, transmitting an institutional heritage across generations as an agency of socialisation. This is the conservative function of education. And secondly, transforming this heritage through critique and creativity. This is the progressive function of education. In a more stable social context it is the first that will be emphasised, while in a society subjected to change and development it must be the second.

Dewey’s approach to education was perhaps more nuanced and contemporary than the Durkheim’s: “education may be conceived either retrospectively or prospectively. That is to say, it may be treated as process of accommodating the future to the past, or as an utilisation of the past for a resource in a developing future.” (Dewey 1957: 92) Dewey would clearly emphasise the second without perhaps entirely dismissing the first. Being more future oriented than Durkheim, he was only too aware of his changing world:

“For we live not in a settled and finished world, but in one which is going on, and where our main task is prospective, and where retrospect – and all knowledge as distinct from thought is retrospect – is of value in the solidity, security,

and fertility it affords our dealings with the future.” (Dewey 1957: 178)

The future of a changing society demands a prospective rather than the retrospective perspective in education. But in both, its transmissive and more especially, in its transformative function education have failed our youth and compromised their future. Paradoxically, the schooling they get is less and less relevant, even as the education they need is becoming more critical and urgent.

The Nehruvian state, in spite of its socialist rhetoric and its egalitarian promise, showed much more continuity than disjunction with its colonial past. The distance of the upper strata of society from the masses is more apparent and even blatant with regard to education! Here a dual system has been evolved, in spite of all official policy, namely a few good institutions to cater to the better off classes and many poor ones to contain the aspirations of the less privileged masses. (Naik 1974: 14)

However, there remained an undertone in much of the social and secular rhetoric of Nehruvian socialism. With the breakdown of the Nehruvian consensus the crisis in education has become increasingly acute. Yet, after more than half a century Independent India has not universalised adult literacy, let alone primary education, nor made available to weaker sections good quality secondary and vocational schools. The Right to Education Act (2010) has taken us sixty years to pass and already there are difficulties in its execution. Government does not have the institutional infrastructure in place and it has to fall back on private agencies.

And yet too many private educational agencies are less concerned with serving a basic social need, than to “capture public resources for private ends” (Rudolph and Rudolph 1972: 23) under the grants-in-aid code, while upward

mobility has become a free for all, no holds barred contest. A private educational mafia is now emerging that is more preoccupied with political patronage and economic returns from their investment in education, rather than with any real educational concerns or pedagogic interests. (Deshpande 2000)

Earlier attempts at a more comprehensive understanding and holistic agenda expressed by the Kothari Commission of 1964-1966, "Education and National Development", (Government of India 1966) has in practice given way to a pragmatic instrumentalisation of education for upward social mobility, whether this be in response to individual or group claims. However, our developmental model has brought us growth without equity. Stark inequalities and social tensions are increasing with our GDP. There is now

"a whole new class of entrants are knocking on the doors of institutionalised education. Denied a fair share in educational opportunities all these years, these new entrants perceive education as a key to gaining status and power, and not always as a means to learn." (Kumar 1998: 10)

Our education must confront social inequalities to bring the marginalised into an egalitarian and participative society, it must also protect the multicultural, pluri-religious diversities of our people, which is being undermined by a cultural nationalism. For too long has the economic-political agenda of development displaced the socio-cultural one of change. Our present crises needs must be addressed on both these dimensions for an effective holistic approach. In the past the role of education has been projected too much in terms of the first to the neglect the second.

This demands a fundamental change of perspective and orientation and not just in education. What we need is 'another development' (Hettne 2009) and 'another politics'

and for both ‘another education’, ‘nai talim’ is a sine qua non. Education for justice would seem to be the only viable alternative for the scale and diversity of a society such as ours. (Wren 1977)

Herein lies the challenge for a model of education that can be mainstreamed for the system at large. A large measure of daring innovation and energetic creativity will be needed for our educators as much, if not more than that of our early pioneers, who institutionalised Western education in pre-independent India. Will our institutions prove open and equal to this? Or after having established a successful school model once, will we continue with it in pursuit of upward mobility into the middle class and a Westernised life style? In no area of governance is such a change of perspective more critical and urgent than in education.

### **A Critical Citizenry**

John Dewey’s *Democracy and Education* in 1916 (Dewey 1957,) with its problem solving approach and project method was intended to train an active and critical citizenry with the cognitive skills needed in society (Heredia 1992). Dewey may be taught in our B.Ed. colleges, but there’s is little evidence of his impact on our system in terms of the formation of a critical citizenry.

The imperative today is education for a just society, to create the social capital for a critical citizenry that will make our democracy work for the common good of all, where social structures and institutional norms are democratically designed and arranged to bridge the ‘justice-gap’ (Samaddar 2009: 16) between comprehensive justice and a realisable one, where social structures and institutional norms must be designed and arranged to facilitate “Voice and Choice” (Sen 2009; 87- ) for each person, for at least an effective minimum to live a decent and dignified life, especially for

the vulnerable and marginalised. For justice in a credible democratic regime, cannot be dictated by a tyranny of the majority, much less imposed by the hegemony of a dominant elite.

Our society has instituted democratic freedoms and civil liberties as fundamental rights. However, economic-political inequalities still remain stubbornly endemic to our system, further accentuated with our economic development, while social-cultural solidarity is increasingly undermined by divisions of caste, class and creed, mobilised for partisan gain, even erupting into collective violence. A relevant education must provide the social capital to create a critical citizenry to resist and reverse this downward spiral into dangerous and retrogressive extremisms and revivalisms of all kinds.

### **Comprehending Justice**

Contending concepts concerning justice with their rival claims to truth often diverge. Mapping a minimal common ground across these is a daunting task. For justice in a society must be founded on a consensus of moral values and implemented fairly by agreed procedures. While the substance of justice must be premised on these values, just procedures must follow due process. However, some viable consensus on both is essential. For then a credible substantive understanding of justice can be spelled out in realisable procedures. This will not result in a comprehensive agenda in our quest for a just society, but in our quest for just ends through just means, it will address and narrow the 'justice-gap' (Samaddar 2009: 16) between the formal claims for, and the practical implementation of justice.

### **Justice as Integral**

A regime deemed to be just, but which eventually leads to injustice, is a contradiction in terms, for a truly just social

structure cannot lead to or perpetuate unjust social results. If it does, it must forfeit its claim to be called just. Therefore the talisman of a just regime must be in just outcomes, not merely in just procedures. In the complex context of a changing society, this apparent tautology is too easily lost sight of, especially in regard to the inequalities and imbalances that a supposedly just regime often precipitates.

Moreover, justice necessarily demands an integrated approach, for justice itself must be integral not only in confronting the contradictions within groups and communities but also the ones between them and across social strata as well. In society justice for one group, or for a section within a group cannot amount to a denial of justice to other groups, or to another section in the group. This seems self-evident: quotas for vulnerable groups must be complementary not contradictory to the interests of other vulnerable groups and persons; what is given to dalits must not undermine what is meant for tribals; nor what is given to some within the community undermine what is due to other members of this community.

But more to the point, justice in one area must not be a negation of justice in another. Affirmative action and minority rights are meant to level the field and protect vulnerable groups, whether economic, social or cultural. If one contradicts the other both will be stymied, the promotion of justice in society discredited, the vulnerable groups left at odds with each other and so worse off for the intervention. Affirmative action that undercuts religious diversity and minority entitlements would be unjust, as would minority rights that contradict human rights of individuals, in and outside the group.

For justice as integral is a crucial test case for any understanding of justice. It must be equally available for,

and equally applied to all. It cannot be the privilege of some and denied to others. I cannot say: justice for us, but not for them, for me, not him or her. Further, justice as equality argues beyond an *equal justice for all* to a *just equality for each*, political, economic and social. This must be the sustainable basis for the pursuit of the other two dimensions of justice: liberty and fraternity or solidarity. A just society must integrate all three.

To grapple with this, a comprehensive and feasible regime of human rights is essential, one that includes fundamental rights, civil and political, social and economic, and equally the corresponding basic duties as well. For in the final analysis, an integral justice is not intended to legitimise a social quest for efficiency, much less for power, but rather to facilitate and privilege a people's desire for a decent and humane society.

Hence justice must be spelt out in terms of rights for minorities, who are culturally vulnerable but still socially valuable in the diversity of our pluralist society, as also for the socially excluded who are marginalised and oppressed, in terms of affirmative action and reservation quotas as instruments for their inclusion because this is seen as a regeneration of our society. How this can be done without precipitating other injustices to other groups and communities, is our most critical challenge today.

### **Liberty, Equality, Fraternity**

Thus liberty, equality, fraternity are three necessary dimensions of an integral social justice, that characterises a just society. (Heredia 2011) Together the three must guide our understanding and pursuit of justice lest we settle for a notional freedom, a legalistic equality, a formal fellowship. At the same time, we must accept that liberty and fraternity

are difficult to quantify and measure and so a consensus on optimum levels of these can be illusive and problematic, except at the extremes of injustice: the violation of fundamental rights to freedom or violent conflict threatening security and life.

Equality however is more amenable to analysis. Indeed, in a democracy, inequalities are the most endemic cause of injustice perceived and justice denied. Justice as equality is the shibboleth of any credible regime of democratic and civil rights, inclusive of the political and the economic, the cultural and the religious domains. However, without liberty these are meaningless, without fraternity their sustainability is at risk. Yet building a consensus on equality is a challenging and daunting task, especially an equality that is fair, free and inclusive.

We know that equal outcomes for the engaged parties on every dimension of social interaction is simply not possible, even with the best intentions of equal justice for all. But when these inequalities add up to become cumulative, then inevitably a society gets stratified into unequal groups of class, castes, races. The exchange between these will necessarily be asymmetric and skewed. Moreover, as is apparent in human history and can be documented from a wide range of social experiences, unequal social exchange within societies and across them, becomes further reinforcing and increasingly pervasive. Whether this is between social groups, and categories, or geographical regions and economic classes ... when left unaddressed, social relationships thus structured will inevitably be oppressive and exploitative.

No matter how much goodwill and charity, unequal exchange only amounts to a benevolent paternalism at best, and patronising debilitation at worst. It fails to contend with structural anomalies at the origins. Downstream effects are

never really remedied until upstream causes are tackled. Treating symptoms does not heal the disease. Hence in any society where economic class, social caste, political power, occupational and educational opportunities, legal access, gender bias, racial privilege ... are mutually reinforcing, then this necessarily leads to increasing inequalities and inevitable injustices.

Justice as equality, where equality is the touchstone of justice, requires that though some inequalities in society might very well be inevitable, these do not become cumulative and embedded in its social structure, or in the interrelationships between and within communities and groups and other societies. Rather, equal justice demands that such multiple inequalities on various dimensions, rather than becoming cumulative, are so structured as to neutralise and defuse each other. This is a difficult conundrum for any democracy but it must be confronted if liberty, equality, fraternity are not to be compromised.

For justice as equality for society means that equity and equality must not be in contradiction. This necessarily implies redistribution in an equitable manner, of inequalities and assets, of advantages and disadvantages ... to create a level playing field where winners are not always winners and no loser always loses. The returns on their performance must be so structured as not to be self-perpetuating or the playing field will no longer remain level. As far as possible this field must be levelled before that can happen, not after it has. This demands effective protection and promotion of the weaker, more vulnerable in society, but not at the cost of political rights and civil liberties of others.

To constructively confront such a dilemma, this ground must be levelled at the bottom of the climb, not flattened at the top into an “egalitarian plateau” (Dworkin 1977 179-183)

for those advantaged enough to be able to get there in the first place. For the exclusion of the most disadvantaged at the very start only leaves an ever more exclusive group to compete for scarce opportunities at the peak.

### **The Just Society**

A credible understanding of social justice must be premised on an integration of the social values, among which liberty, equality, solidarity are definitive as necessary conditions for a just society. This goes beyond the righteousness of persons and fairness in society, whether in exchange or distribution, to provide a structural framework for fundamental rights and basic needs as essential entitlements for human identity and dignity. For basic needs represent the minimum required to live with some dignity, and fundamental rights underwrite the human agency needed to affirm one's identity. Both these must be guaranteed and extended in a just society.

All too often the injustices in a society are the unintended and unanticipated consequences of ill-adapted institutional structures and consequently a skewed implementation of justice. However, intended or not, untoward outcomes must be addressed if not in anticipation at least in retrospect. For implementing an idea of justice that eventually brings injustice in practice is a cruel contradiction. A stable and sustainable justice must carry over from the ideal to actual. Moreover, if justice is to be understood as credible and is to be seen as implementable, we need to look at in the context of its distinct but not separate dimensions: individual behaviour, exchange transactions, the distribution of social goods and services, and institutional structures and relationships.

These dimensions and levels of justice are complementary and so must be integrated and balanced in a society to be just. This demands a justice premised on liberty, critiqued by equality and affirmed in solidarity, so that an inclusive

solidarity provides the context for social equality that is respectful of civic liberties and democratic rights. In other words a fraternal solidarity that is a co-responsibility for each other in a commitment to a life of dignity and identity for all. But this is still a vision for a just society, not a blueprint for its social structures.

A just society attempts to steer the difficult course past libertarians, socialists and communitarians, who privilege one or the other dimension of justice at the cost of the others. For “justice is our critic, not our mirror” that calls us to “always ask of some settled institutional scheme whether it is fair” (Dworkin 1985: 219). A vision of justice is not meant to mirror back to us the way we are, but to critique it and challenge and us to be the way we ought. This cannot be decided by majoritarian opinion or even by majority vote, for then might would become right, whereas justice must speak truth to power, in the public domain.

This then is the understanding of justice on which the argument of this presentation is premised: justice must protect and promote liberty, it is best measured and authenticated by equality, it can only be sustained and extended with fraternity. Any critique of affirmative action, whether in terms of reservation quotas or protective discrimination; any discussion of minority rights in terms of Constitutional guarantees or Directive Principles, must be premised on a justice that is defined by all these three: liberty, equality, fraternity.

## **Education and Change**

The relationship of education to society is a problematic one. Earlier an optimistic philosophy prevailed:

“It was uncritically assumed that education could cure all kinds of social problems and, particularly, that it could

bring about more equality among men. As the sociology of education developed, this was progressively reversed and a new philosophy, a pessimistic one, emerged more and more convincingly. It may be summarized in the statement that schooling is unable to reduce to any considerable extent the inequalities among individuals which result from social background.” (Boudon 1974: xii)

The Education Commission Report (1964-66) subtitled “Education and National Development” reflected this earlier optimism when it emphatically affirmed, that for “change on a grand scale....there is one instrument and one instrument only, that can be used: Education.” (Government of India 1966: 79).

In the pessimistic neo-Marxist view, best expressed by Gramsci (1957) education becomes the ideological instrument of class domination and control. It merely produces “officers of the ruling class for the exercise of subordinate functions of social hegemony and political government” (Gramsci 1957: 124) Thus the modern school replaces the medieval Church as the dominant ideological state apparatus.

The new critical sociology of the sixties and seventies, provided the basis for an incisive critique of the relationship of education and society. It “provided a discourse for re-examining the relationship among knowledge, culture, and power, on the one hand, and schooling and the issue of control on the other.” (Aronowitz and Giroux 1985: 144)

Education was now seen as a dependent variable, not a causative one in the social system. It reflected and reproduced the social structure and culture of the dominant groups that controlled it. The school institutionalized the distribution of knowledge and skills so as to perpetuate the relative class status of different groups in society. The pedagogic process

internalized and legitimized the values and disciplines that sustained the status quo. Hence the urgency of Deschooling Society. (Illich 1973) and developing an alternative Pedagogy of the Oppressed. (Freire 1972)

Some versions of this critique were so deterministic as to leave little room for an authentic “human praxis”. Historical necessity seems to displace hope and struggle. But the process of domination is never stable or complete in a society. There are “spaces” where subordinate groups do confront and can contest superordinate ones. People do resist and the “ruptural effects of conflict and struggle”, (Foucault 1980:82) often arise among the marginalized and then flow into and affect the mainstream. It is not just the reflection and ‘reproduction’ of the old in society, that we must critique; there is also the production and creation of the new, that we must make possible.

In the complex, multi-causal situation of a changing society, neither of the two extreme positions sketched above are very helpful. The reciprocity between these various subsystems in modern society cannot be ignored by policy-makers and social-planning today, even while conceding that one or the other is the dominant system. Moreover, it is hardly possible to deny all causal efficacy to education, especially in the Third World. For “when we have clear evidence of the role of education creating conditions of change, it is usually from the Third world rather than the West.” (Di Bona and Singh 1987: 126)

### **Approaches to Education**

There are two levels at which the role of education can be analysed. At the socio-psychological level of analysis, educators favour a pedagogic approach. This would focus on teachers and students, teaching-learning methods, .... These

must be studied and implemented in the classroom and the school. However, teaching is a relationship that concerns more than just individual teachers and learners. The classroom is not meant to be a closed laboratory experiment, for the teaching relationship is always situated in the real life context of a group located in the institution and in the larger society, in which this teaching-learning takes place. Hence this pedagogic approach to education must be opened to other approaches that take these into consideration.

The socio-cultural approach goes beyond that of social-psychologists who study individual behaviour in the group. They focus on institutions in society. Thus educational sociologists are more concerned with the relationship between an education system and social structures like the family, class stratification, caste hierarchy, the state, etc.. Anthropologists who focus on education are more concerned with the relationship of education to cultural values and norms, social traditions and local customs etc.. Similarly, economists and political scientists, focus on the relationship between the economic-political system and education in society, particularly the role of the state and its governance.

These approaches must complement each other. A social analysis of structures of a society would be incomplete without a corresponding analysis of its social institutions and cultural traditions, as also of its political systems. Further an historical approach broadens the context by situating it in a timeframe. An adequate understanding of education in society must embrace in some measure all these and more. Thus an inter-disciplinary approach must integrate the pedagogic, the socio-cultural, and the historical, or else perceptions and understandings will inevitably be inadequate and one-sided. At the critical juncture at which education in this country finds itself, nothing less will do.

Effective classroom pedagogy, must consider not only such socio-cultural circumstances of the student in the school, but also those of the school in the community and the community in society. Obviously, an upper class, English medium, urban school will be very different from a lower class, vernacular medium, rural school. Religion and caste further complicate the differences and historical circumstance further nuances this impact. An education for an inclusive participative society of critical and sensitive citizens must contribute minimising the differences not accentuating them. All this brings into play economic and political forces that condition the school and the student, often with unintended and unanticipated consequences. The resources and goodwill needed for a viable education cannot be independent of any of this.

In a formally democratic system, what legitimates the blatant inequality is “the ritual of mass examinations” which “carry a symbolic message – that all individuals have an equal chance. Thus, while emphasis on early selection ensures special treatment to the children of those who can afford to make extra inputs, mass examination promises total parity among all the candidates.” (Kumar 1987:32)

This makes for “sponsored” not “contest” mobility. (Turner 1961) Such supposed ‘equality’ between ‘unequals’ perpetuates and legitimates the status quo even while keeping “the confidence and aspirations of the masses alive.” (Kumar 1987: 32) Elementary education in India, and now pre-primary kindergarten classes in our cities, provide a stark illustration of this.

There is within the system a “key dialectic” that operates through two crucial mechanisms: “early selection and mass examinations.” (Kumar 1987: 27-41) already at their

point of entry into the education system the children are streamed at two levels: on the one hand the rather expensive, and generally privately run, urban based English medium schools which prepare them for an elite status in later life; on the other hand, the freely offered, generally rural based, vernacular medium schools run by local government bodies, that prepare young people to accept lower status occupations.

**J.P.Naik's remark on Indian education is pertinent:**

“In fact, the primary object of the system is not to spread education among the people but to function as an efficient and merciless mechanism to select individuals who should continue to remain in the privileged sector or enter it afresh.” (Naik 1982: 170)

Raymond Boudon, postulates “a two-stage filtering process” for the social status of individuals: “In the first they go from a given social background to a given educational level. In the second stage they go from educational level to achieved status.” (Boudon 1974: 21) Here the endemic divisions and prejudices of caste and class, of ethnicity and race, even the canons of our secular society stymie the translation of personal education into social achievement.

**Dilemmas and Contradictions**

This results in a dual system of education: one for the haves – mostly but only run by private agencies – and another for the have-nots – for those mostly, but not only run by government departments. Here we indicate some of the basic dilemmas confronting education in our country today: pedagogic, cultural, societal, political, economic.

The pedagogic dilemma concerns the humanist versus the instrumental perspectives on education. Is education an end or a means? Is it a value-in-itself or a means-to-a-goal? Is

its purpose to draw out the best in persons, help them grow to their full potential as human beings, and become good citizens of society? Or is it to be concerned with skills and techniques for individual advancement in a professional career, with promising economic returns, prestige and security. In other words, should education focus on bringing out the creative potential of students and motivate and equip them for some larger cause or on training them for the job-market for gainful employment?

The societal dilemma centres on the emphasis given to mass versus elite education. Is education to be freely and equally available to all or accessible on the basis of merit? Must education be a leveller that opens equal opportunity and for all or do we create islands of excellences and talent? Do we strive to level playing field for all or wait for a rising tide to lift all boats? Should we prioritise the higher levels of education and research, or the more basic and mass-based ones? A scientific-technical education, or a liberal-humanist one?

The cultural dilemma focuses on the stress given to cultural orientations, whether Indic or Western, modern or traditional, and most especially in terms of language, whether mother-tongue or regional, or on one that gives access to the world on the national and international stage. Should students be grounded in the local and rooted in their own culture? Or open to the global and vitalised by a multiculturalism? Socialised into a collective uniformity or prepared for a cultural pluralism? Isolated in their ethnic communities or integrated into a larger secular pluralist society?

The political dilemma is the orientation of the education system to civic duties and democratic rights, whether citizens' duties and obligations are to be prioritised for its students or rather their civil rights and liberties stressed. Should

educational institution discipline students in the prevailing social customs and mores, regulations and laws? Or should a concern for social justice and equity, sensitivity to human rights and compassion for the under-dog be instilled as a priority? Should citizens be socialised into being orderly and disciplined or made aware of their rights and responsibilities?

Similarly, the economic dilemma concerns the allocation of scarce resources to prioritised goals. Given the limited resources and different levels of individual achievement and talent, are the available resource to be used on the basis of efficiency for the greatest advantage of society by allocating them to the most talented and meritorious as we wait for the benefits to eventually trickle down to others less able and gifted, or are these resources to be allocated on the basis of equity to the most needy to enable them to live with dignity and purpose.

### **A Creative Dialectic**

These dilemmas are not mutually exclusive contradictions that force an either/or option on us. Rather they represent tensions between polarities both of which must be affirmed in a creative dialectic. For such tension are not resolved, they must be lived through as we situate our own option among the alternatives available to us. It is the practical and prudential choices we make that will create the new institutional alternatives which must be replicable models for an education for a future that is confronting us already. Our postcolonial education system must do today what once the precolonial one did earlier: create and stabilise a new institutional model for the country to meet the new challenges confronting us in building a socialist, secular, democratic nation.

The challenge is to find a creative composite that will combine both polarities of the dilemmas. For the education we need is one that is truly humanist and also useful, training good

citizens and competent contributors for our society. It must include the masses of our people, education them for a participative and critical citizenship, even as it strives to raise standards of excellence by rewarding real merit and true talent, combining this with a noblesse oblige that will give back from the largesse received. It must be rooted and open, culturally authentic and genuinely multicultural. It must balance responsibilities and rights, critique and discipline. This must be an on-going process, a project continually in the making, and where the clarity of our vision and our commitment to the goal will assure a periodic course correction and a sure, if gradual incremental progress.

A critical and creative response to these dilemmas must address the underlying contradictions and our persistent ambiguities. We want our teachers to be creative and we rail against government rules and regulations. But our administrators exercise a strict control over them and replicate the government bureaucracy in our institutions. Officially we publicise an integral, humanist education but in practice we allow the compulsions of the system and the requirements of good examination results displaces this as a prioritized goal. We want to prepare our students for a multicultural, globalizing world while our faculties and institutions are enmeshed in local prejudices and ethnocentrism. Publicly we stand for human rights, but our managements are often at odds with just claim and fair dues in our own institutions. We proclaim our preferential option for the poor, and then rationalise our elitist institutions with a top-down understanding of leadership and a trickle-down theory of social change and so compromise proclaimed egalitarian commitments and our preferential option for the poor.

These ambiguities are not moral lacunae so much as structural dysfunctions of institutions unable to respond

to the contradictions of the system they are caught up in. Accepting the contradictions and addressing our own ambiguities in this regard will require a willingness to invest in new institutional models that runs counter to the old familiar ones. This is new wine and it will not go into old wine skins. It is bound to meet with difficulties and opposition from the status quo, both educators and beneficiaries of our schools. Before we measure the cost of change against the loss of not changing, we would do well to recall the courage and confidence of the early pioneers in the country and feel part of their saga before casting the dye.

### **A Transformative Pedagogic Paradigm**

The transmission of a society's social heritage to future generations, could well lead to stagnation without the transformation of this inheritance. Both conservative and creative functions are basic to education: the first without the second would mean stagnation in the present status quo; the second without the first, would be reinventing the wheel again and again. In creative interface the two functions could add up to Paulo Freire's *Cultural Action for Freedom*. (Freire 1973).

To break through the securities and constraints of the present into the challenge and uncertainties of the future will demand a new paradigm for education to counter the prevailing institutional culture of the system. This can only be viable with correspondingly transformative pedagogies. Specifying some of these will help articulate a new model for the future, one that will seek to change, rather than just to interpret the world for our students; one that will inspire them to change the world they find for the better rather than just adjust to, and succeed in it. Most institutions have not always shown the internal resilience or sought the external cooperation to generate

such a counter-dynamic for transformative pedagogic paradigm.

Alternative transformative pedagogies can have a crucial and cumulative impact on some of the critical dimensions of the system, eventually contributing to changing it. Here we will sketch a few these: teaching as an art implying a personalised and creative relationship between teacher and taught; the development of human potential for more authentic and fulfilling living; a value formation and commitment that will build a counter-culture and make for the goal of a contrast-community. The liberative potential of education in such a community will depend on some fundamental pedagogic options: against pedagogies of violence and silence; and for those of subaltern affirmation, of relevant contextualisation and creative critique.

### **Pedagogy as a Creative Art**

As with creative art, creativity pedagogies cannot be standardised. For teaching as a relationship will obviously imply something of the uniqueness of the persons involved: teachers and learners. This is why it is more an art than a technique, and art is learnt by practice not in theory. Moreover, teaching necessarily implies a relationship which depends on the competence and credibility of the teacher, and the preparedness and openness of the taught. To be a creative relationship teaching needs must be both a personalised and a contextualised one. It must be sensitive to the personal freedom and social circumstances of both the teacher and taught. This will be the precondition for a creativity that is both personally and socially transformative.

### **Pedagogy as a Humanist Discipline**

The development, “drawing out”, of human potential the student is the humanist goal of education, (from the Latin

educare to lead out). For the humanist this in the order of ends, a value-in-itself and not to be instrumentalised by lesser interests. When these become the goal of education then means displace ends and the fundamental humanising potential of education is severely compromised. Moreover, institutionalised means have unintended consequences that can be very different from their original purpose, sometimes the very opposite of what might have been intended. Thus examinations are meant to monitor pedagogic progress. But now they perform a gate-keeping function screening access to further opportunities in life. Studying for examinations becomes more important than learning the subject, the emphasis on high marks stymies creative teaching....

Such an instrumental approach to education can be transferred to other areas of life, where public success and the recognition it brings becomes the motivating force, rather than human growth and the achievement it represents. This adds up to a colossal failure of our education system, and the consequences are already apparent in the stresses and strains that are undermining our social order.

### **Pedagogy as Ethical transformation**

Further, at the institutional level, the organisational climate constitutes the context in which this individual interaction takes place. For the ethical atmosphere of an institution is made by the values experienced in its decision-making. Syllabus construction and teaching methodologies are most concerned with the development of skills and disciplines. These are an essential dimension of any pedagogic process in any education system, but underpinning this must be a foundation of ethical values. A value-free pedagogy can only make for a 'valueless' education! Value-neutrality implicitly supports established values and consequently the status quo. The critical challenge is to integrate value-formation and

value-commitment This is surely a crucial and urgent matter for a humanist education, especially in this country today where social changes have precipitated nothing short of a moral crisis.

Moreover, if the change we seek to initiate is to be transformative, it must be value-premised in terms that operationalise our vision and mission and integrated into the pedagogic process with the priority of goals, not just as means. This can only be done in the actual practice of individuals, especially the significant ones, and the actual allocation of resource, especially the scarce ones. Moreover, a contradiction between action and word is seen by young people as hypocritical and evokes cynicism. Hence the integrity of life and example of the educator is most crucial.

### **The Pedagogy of Violence**

Stressing the conservative function of pedagogic transmission to the negation of the liberative one of transformation, reproduces the dominant culture, while subordinating and co-opting the non-dominant ones. Moreover, once this culture of oppression is internalised it appears to be the naturally given, and hence the uncontested and the incontestable order of things. The potential of people to learn from their experiences even the negative ones is perverted by excluding liberative experiences from the learning process, or forcing them into an interpretive grid of the dominant culture. This precisely is the violence of such a pedagogy, and the more pernicious for not being overt.

For as Habermus rightfully remarks: “not ‘learning’, but ‘not-learning’ is the phenomenon that calls for explanation at the socio-cultural level of development”! (Habermus, 1975) Lele illustrates “The Political Appropriation of Bhakti” with regard to its egalitarian potential, particularly of the Varkari Pant in Maharashtra and more generally of the bhakti

movement in medieval India, and he goes on to argue, that at present this is precisely the role of “Hindutva as Pedagogic Violence”. (Lele 1994) Thus in our education system “the role of strengthening group solidarity among the educated” is far more prevalent than the one “of disturbing traditional hierarchies”. (Kumar 1991) Our educational institutions trapped in the system must swim against the tide, or they will go with the flow.

### **The Pedagogy of Silence**

A culture of protest may remain subterranean for long periods. It may find expression in low-intensity continuing encounters or dramatically irrupt in violent clashes. It may find expression in a people’s movements that can precipitate sudden, even violent change. Till then an adaptive pedagogy of ‘silence’ results in a more passive, but all the same alienating violence, including that of the victims against themselves in self-deprecation and hate. This easily leads to repression and inhibits the healing process.

Most often we fall into such a pedagogy of silence by default. We have nothing to say or are afraid to say it. But one cannot be neutral in the face of such pedagogic violence. Silence at such moments from significant persons in their lives, leaves an unexplained emptiness, a sensitive space with which the young have to cope with on their own. The vacuum is readily ‘colonised’ by other explanations and interpretations so easily available with the overload of today’s communications media. (Kumar 1996)

### **The Pedagogy of Subaltern Affirmation**

The earlier two pedagogies either by design or default negate subaltern culture or leave it open to manipulation or subversion. As such they can hardly make for transformative cultural change. This demands a pedagogy that will not do

violence to, or silence the subalterns, but one that will affirm them in their identity and dignity, in their quest for a place in the sun; a pedagogy that will eventually replace the need for positive discrimination for the disadvantaged with a level playing field for all. Exclusions only reinforce negative identities and social alienation, whether these be deliberate options, or part of the hidden agenda in our education system. (Taylor 1992)

In all human societies this is a continuing need for an authentic affirmation of the cultures of non-dominant groups, not an uncritical idealisation or a romantic indigenism. Idealisation glosses over the negative aspects of a culture that need to be purged. Indigenism easily becomes regressively isolationist. In a globalising world this is disastrous if it is possible at all. Only a constructive critique of these cultures can lead to a critical affirmation of underprivileged groups and a humanising counter-culture. Tokenism is counter-productive. It obfuscates the real challenge of including the knowledge and skills, the values and lore of groups, exiled from the formal learning process.

Gandhiji's 'nai talim', or basic education, had the potential for reversing this subjugation of subaltern knowledge and skills by giving them a central place in the school system. 'Nai talim' was too threatening to vested interests to be acceptable to them. (Heredia 2000) So it was marginalised and diluted, then co-opted as a token concession in a completely ineffective form, and now laid quietly to rest! It survives if at all as lesser education for less other people's children.

### **The Pedagogy of Creative Critique**

If the subaltern affirmation sets the socio-cultural context, a creative critique addresses the inter-personal one within it.

For it is here that the teaching relationship is best expressed as an art at the inter-personal level of the learning experience. Now if the teacher-student relationship is at the centre of the pedagogic process, then it must be given a corresponding priority in the educational system. To be creative this relationship must involve the active and free participation of students and teachers. Internal passivity and external control cannot make for creativity of any sort. Autonomy and competence are the most basic conditions for a creative pedagogy, but they are far from being a priority of any kind in our system. (Kumar 1992)

Our teachers at most levels are confined to standardised and narrowly defined roles. The compulsions of the external examination system, with its pre-set syllabus, its standardised and opaque evaluation processes, destroys whatever innovative and creative urge that would otherwise be possible. No wonder in our system the educational administrator has far more status and influence than the pedagogue or the scholar.

Rote learning and mechanical reproduction are at a high premium, while critique and creativity at a disheartening discount. Even science is still taught with the authority of the textbook commanding acceptance and not the excitement of the laboratory experiment leading to personal discovery. Such 'indoctrination' cannot encourage the scientific temper. It only allows superstitions and uncritical traditions to survive and thrive.

With the humanities, even within the confines of the conventional canon, there is scope to contextualise and focus on those aspects that make for a sensitivity and openness to counter-cultural concerns and subaltern aspirations. This is more directly possible with the social sciences, provided they eschew the pretended value-free stance of positivist

science, as also the prevalent value-relativism espoused by post-modernism, and opt for a broad and humanist value-premised critique. An inter-disciplinary approach can further broaden and deepen their perspectives.

### **The Pedagogy of Relevant Contextualisation**

This is the final and necessary step in a pedagogy of change. For divorced from the social context teaching cannot be made relevant. However, without a deliberate effort by the teacher to relate the subject matter taught in the classroom to the world outside, this will not automatically happen. If anything the rote learning and mechanical reproduction encouraged by our education system disengages the students from their social situation. The preoccupation for individuals and institutions to return good exam results does not help to understand and cope with the world around.

Some subjects lend themselves to this contextualising more readily than others. Thus environmental sciences cannot ignore the ecological crisis that threatens us all today. The same can be done with social sciences and our social crises by contextualising constructed meanings in their social situations, and in literature studies by demonstrating the relationship between writing literature and writing culture. Furthermore, we can identify and study new and relevant initiatives, and support and learn from them wherever we find them. Some innovative and competent voluntary agencies, like Eklavya in Hoshangabad district of Madhya Pradesh, have already blazed a new trail.

In all this, alternative understandings can be made to question conventional wisdom and suggest more relevant contextualised responses. The classroom is often too divorced from the real world of our students. If it helps them to comprehend and critique their world, we will already have begun a transformative change of lasting effect. In helping

students thus to understand and interpret their world the teacher can also help them reconstruct it in more creative and humane ways. A relevant contextualisation of learning can address contradictions between academic learning and practical life, raise questions, pursue issues and challenge the young to create a brave new world.

### **Practical Possibilities**

Much of what is being proposed here is possible even within the constraints of the present system. The more recently moves to greater flexibility are in the right direction: institutional autonomy with experimental school, the open school system, autonomous colleges, deem universities, ... The principle of subsidiarity can serve as practical guideline to devolve such academic authority and consequent freedom downwards to reach the teacher in the classroom, to devolve decision to lower levels to those competence there, ... This must be complemented and co-ordinated from higher levels by a practical solidarity to enables competent decision-making at these levels and facilitate implementation as required....

The transformative paradigm with its counter-cultural options, both individual and institutional, can eventually have a cumulative effect and change the system, if not completely, then at least in parts. Surely we can use the vast goodwill some of our prestigious institutions, not to get more of the same, but to give credibility to, and get acceptance for such creative ventures. The temptation to postpone decisions, until there is no need to make them, allows circumstances to get beyond our control so that decisions are finally happen by default and drift. This can only lead us into the dustbin of history!

Habermus rightfully observes: “truths which are to have consequences require a consensus prudently attained.” (Habermus 1975) Hence it is important for a pedagogy

of change to contest, and provide alternatives to the conventional 'truth' which is all too often nothing but the imposed conventions of hegemonic groups. It is precisely in this sense that Giroux wants teachers to be "transformative intellectuals". (Giroux 1988: 121) For then "Teaching as a Subversive Activity" (Postman and Weingartner 1975) can further advance a consequent learning, and challenge the status quo to build communities of solidarity, of sharing and caring in our society.

Our practical, even pragmatic focus cannot be just to teach the three 'r's to fit students into a cybernetic world, but to read that world and understand it, to interpret and change it, to claim and share it. These transformative pedagogies must be institutionally situated lest they be dismissed as impractically utopian. This will require a new model for a transformative education.

### **A Model for the Future**

In a rapidly and radically changing world, this will not be the one to which their teachers and parents belong, but one still unfolding. Margret Mead called this a prefigurative culture for which the models of learning are not in the past as with a post figurative culture, or even in the present as with a configurtive culture, but rather in the future. (Mead 1970: 67). In such a society education cannot be premised on 'models of' oriented not to the past or even to the present but rather on 'models for' that anticipate the future crashing in on us. (Geertz 1793: 93)

### **A Working Consensus**

An effective model for such change must be premised on some common ground on which can be built a consensus for collective action, a vision and mission within the larger social context of the education system. Here we indicate in

a few broad brush strokes as a point of departure for this endeavour to create and establish a model for education that is true to our history and able to carry forward this saga into the future, where it can once again seize the significant role it once played in the making of modern India.

Today we need a new institutional model that can then be stabilised and replicated in the larger system to meet the educational demands of a changing society. It must be perceived as leading the way and calling other educators to where we are going, and where they know they ought to be. Its effectiveness must be measured not in terms of the old criteria, like examination performance, institutional prestige, ..., but on new more pertinent ones for the changed circumstances, like preparing students to be other- not self-oriented, critical and creative, to be self-employed entrepreneurs rather than employable job-seekers, equipping them with the skills for problem-solving in a complex and inter-connected world not applying old solutions to new problems, empowering them with the ability for a continuing self-education and skills up-gradation not leaving them with a self-satisfied sense of closure.

### **Practical Possibilities**

We cannot completely deschool our society, as Ivan Illich has urged. (Illich 1973) But we do need to exorcise our institutions from the banking pedagogy that Paulo Freire (Freire 1972) decried, which rote learning foregrounds, and our evaluation system rewards. Here viable expansive possibilities have not been imaginatively adapted to our changing contemporary situations and creatively mainstreamed into it. However, there are some who have already started out on the path of pedagogic innovation with alternatives schools that have demonstrated that a total alienation from the mainstream is neither required nor viable.

(see <http://www.alternativeeducationindia.net/altschools.htm>)

In their six-nation review of *School and Community in the Third World*, Sinclair and Lilis offer three possible strategies for educational change which are here quoted at length:

“the first is thus the stepwise development of a subpopulation of innovating institutions. This would be the preferred policy, if political and other pressures allowed such choice. The second model offered for consideration is that of universal adoption of a relevance orientation but with a two-tier system permitting stepwise development of high-quality programmes in an expanding group of selected innovative schools. This policy would have much to commend it where political pressures necessitated immediate system-wide adoption of some kind of relevance venture. A third strategy involves the omission of any special relevance programmes but attempts to reorient the existing curriculum towards activity methods and local relevance. An attempt to build on its strengths and overcome its weakness would be appropriate where the government was unwilling to provide the resources and organisational infrastructure for a major relevance programme.” (Sinclair and Lilis 1980: 164)

Given their spread through many locations in this country, there are strategies most institutions can adopt with some systematic planning and inter-institutional cooperation in a particular region or area. But if we set our sail against the wind we must be able to stay the course and brave the storms. For

“while it is comparatively easy to introduce educational reforms that support the existing social structure, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to implement radical educational reforms which threaten the existing social

structure or run counter to its imperatives.” (Citizens for Democracy 1978: 35)

More than half a century after ago we pledge ourselves as a “sovereign, socialist, secular, democratic Republic ... to secure for all its citizens:

justice, social, economic and political;  
liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship;  
equality of status and of opportunity;  
and to promote among them all,  
fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity and integrity of the nation”.(Preamble to the Constitution)

The challenge of education for justice is to create a viable model for such a society towards fulfilling this trust with destiny. No doubt we cannot wish away the constraints under which our education institutions labour. And yet in the interstices of all the contradictions and anomalies of our society there are spaces of freedom still available, which must be seized and creatively used.

## References

1. Aronowitz, Stanley and Henry A. Giroux. 1985. *Education Under Siege: Conservative, Liberal, and Radical Debate over Schooling*, Bergin and Gravey, South Hadly, Massachusetts.
2. Boudon, Raymond, 1974, *Education, Opportunity, and Social Inequality: Changing Prospects in Western Society*, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
3. Citizens for Democracy, 1978, *Education for Our People*, Allied Pub. Mumbai.
4. Dewey, John. 1957, 1st 1916, *Democracy and Education: An*

- Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. Macmillan, New York.
5. Deshpande, J.V., 2000. "Education as Business", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.35, Nos. 28 &29, 15 Jul., pp. 2506 - 8.
  6. Dworkin, Ronald. 1985, *A Matter of Principle*, Harvard Univ. Press, London.
  7. Dworkin, Ronald (1977): *Taking Rights Seriously*, Harvard University Press.
  8. Di Bona, Joseph, and R. P. Singh, "Modernity of Tradition in Indian Education," in *Education and the Process of Change*, in eds. Ghosh Ratna and Mathew Zachariah, op. cit. Sage Publishers, N. Delhi, 1987.
  9. Durkheim, Emile, 1956 (1st 1922) *Education and Sociology*, The Free Press, New York.
  10. *Education and National Development: Report of the Education Commission (1964-66)*. Ministry of Education. Government of India. Delhi. 1966. Also known as the Kotahri Commission.
  11. Foucault, Michel, 1980, *Power and Knowledge, Selected Interviews and Other Writings*, ed. C. Gordon, Pantheon, New York.
  12. Freire, Paulo 1973. *Cultural Action for Freedom*, Penguin, England.
  13. Geertz, Clifford, 1973, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Fontana Press, New York.
  14. Freire, Paulo, 1972, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Penguin, London.

15. Ghosh, Ratna and Mathew Zachariah, eds., 1987, *Education and the Process of Change*, Sage Publishers, N. Delhi.
16. Gramsci, Antonio, 1957 *The Modern Prince and Other writings*, International Publishers, New York.
17. Habermus, Jurgen, 1975. *Legitimation Crisis*, Beacon Press, Boston.
18. Halsey, A. H., J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson, eds., *Education, Economy and Society*, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill.
19. Hettne, Bjorn, 2009, *Thinking about Development: Development Matters*, Zed Books, London.
20. Heredia, Rudolf C., 2011, "Just Ends through Just Means: Justice as Liberty, Equality, Fraternity", *Economic and Political Weekly*, V. 46, N. 5, 30 Jan. pp. 62-67.
21. Heredia, Rudolf C., 2000, "Revisiting Gandhi, Rethinking 'Nai Talim': An Approach for Non-formal Vocational Education", *New Frontiers in Education*, Vol. 30, No.3, Jul-Sep, pp.259 - 267.
22. Heredia, Rudolf C., *Structure and Performance of College Education: An Organisational Analysis of Arts and Science Colleges in Bombay*, Somaiya Pub., Bombay, 1981, pp. xiv + 192, Rs. 65.
23. Heredia, Rudolf C., *Tribal Education for Community Development: A study of Schooling in the Talasari Mission Area*, Concept Pub. N. Delhi, 1992.
24. Heredia, Rudolf C., *Taking Sides: Reservation Quotas and Minority Rights*, Penguin, N. Delhi, Oct 1212.
25. Illich, Ivan, 1973, *Deschooling Society*, Penguin, England

26. Kumar, Krishna. 1999. "Roots of Aggression: Art as a Custodian of Peace", *Times of India*, 29 July, p.10.
27. Kumar, Krishna. 1998. "Ideological Obsession: Neglect of Education Continues", *Times of India*, 25 Nov., p.10.
28. Kumar, Krishna. 1996. *Learning from Conflict*, Orient Longman, Hyderabad.
29. Kumar, Krishna, 1995, "Listening to Gandhi", *Seminar*, No. 436, Dec. pp. 14-19. pp.259 - 267.
30. Kumar, Krishna. 2000. "Noise and Design", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 35, No. 13, 25 Mar., p.1057.
31. Kumar, Krishna. 1992. *What is Worth Teaching?* Orient Longman, Delhi.
32. Kumar, Krishna, 1987, "Reproduction or Change? Education and Elites in India," in Ghosh R.and Z. Mathew eds., op.cit., p. 27-41.
33. Marx, Karl, Frederick Engels, 1969, *Theses On Feuerbach*, Selected Works, Volume 1, pp. 13 – 15; Moscow, USSR, 1969; 1st pub 1845
34. Mead, Margaret, 1970, *Culture and Commitment: A Study of the Generation Gap*, Museum of Natural Histgory Press, Washinginton, D.C..
35. Naik, J. P., 1982, *The Education Commission and After*, Allied Pub., N.Delhip.44.
36. Naik, J. P., 1974. *Policy and Performance In Indian Education, 1947 - 74*, Orient Longman, N. Delhi.
37. Postman, Neil and Charles Weingartner, 1975, *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, Penguin, England.

38. Rudolph Susanne, and Lloyd T. Rudolph, (eds). 1972. *Education and Politics in India*, Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
39. Samaddar, Ranabir, ed., 2009, *State of Justice in India: Issues of Social Justice*, Vol. 2, “Series Introduction, pp. 8-26, Sage, N. Delhi.
40. Sen, Amartya, 2009, *The Idea of Justice*, Allen Lane, Penguin Books.
41. Sinclair, M.E. and Kevin Lillis, 1980, *School and Community in the Third World*, Croom Helm, London.
42. Turner, R. H., 1961 “Modes of Social Ascent Through Education: Sponsored and Contest Mobility,” in A. H. Halsey, et al., op. cit.
43. Wells, H.G., 2004, (1st 1920), *The Outline of Human History*, 4 vols., Barnes and Noble, New York.
44. Wren, Brian, 1977, *Education for Justice*, SCM Press, London.