

PHILOSOPHICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES OF EDUCATION

Dr. Vikramendra Kumar, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi, New Delhi

Bardhan.vikramendra@gmail.com

Abstract

Philosophy forms the bedrock of education, which is a rapidly developing scientific discipline. Education, which has been appropriately characterised as the dynamic side of philosophy, is the primary tool of philosophy, even if the ultimate aim of philosophy is to provide explanations for the mysterious nature of the cosmos, humanity's role within it, and the myriad issues that arise from both human wisdom and foolishness. Philosophy in action is what we mean when we talk about education. The foundation of philosophy illuminates all pedagogical practices. Hence, "the art of education will never attain complete clearness without philosophy" is a highly valid observation. Both philosophy and education rely on and are affected by one another. Education follows philosophy, which lays forth the paths. Education without philosophy would be a fruitless endeavour, and philosophy without education would be severely limited. "Philosophy and education are two sides of the same coin. The former is the contemplative side while the latter is the active side," Ross said. Philosophy is the end result of education. Philosophical questions undergird all issues in education. Simply said, educational philosophy is the study and practice of applying philosophical principles to the area of education with the goal of addressing the many challenges that arise in this domain. If you want to know why we educate (our objective), who we educate (the children), how we educate (our techniques), when we educate (our motivation), where we educate (our school), what we teach (our curriculum), and how we teach it, then you need to read educational philosophy. "An adequate philosophy of life is the foundation of a sound philosophy of education," said the author further. Education and philosophy are mutually supportive; they influence and shape one another through the ever-changing currents of ideas and deeds. Thus, "philosophy of education" refers to the process of applying overarching philosophical views to issues in the field of education.

Keywords: philosophy, education, method, curriculum, teacher, motivation, school, life

Introduction

Education, both in theory and practice, has long been influenced by philosophical ideas. The true goal that education should strive towards is decided by it. "Education is laboratory in which philosophic distinctions become concrete, and are tested," to quote Dewey. Education passes on philosophical knowledge from one generation to the next. Philosophy is a framework for understanding the world, and education is all about incorporating that framework into lesson

plans. Education is a lifelong process, whereas philosophy is a way of life. Philosophy is the study of facts gleaned from observation and logic, whereas education is the process of honing analytical and reasoning skills. Everything in education is shaped by philosophy: Philosophy is at the heart of all educational issues. "Education without philosophy would mean a failure to understand the precise nature of education," Gentile explains. Reason being, one's life's and one's education's goals are defined by philosophical considerations. A philosophy undergirds all facets of schooling. Everything in education is shaped and dictated by philosophy. This includes goals, curricula, procedures, textbooks, discipline, teachers, and more. Philosophy investigates the depth and breadth of schooling. Curriculum, pedagogy, textbooks, the teacher's position, and school discipline are all shaped by the goals that philosophy brings to education. The requirements of both individuals and society can be better met when curricula are built with this in mind. Philosophical underpinnings of life and education are demanded from all sides of educational issues, according to J.S. Ross. Both Western and Eastern thinkers of great stature have made significant contributions to the field of education. The lives and teachings of all the great philosophers, from Socrates to John Dewey in the West and Yajnavalka to Gandhi in the East, provide the clearest instances of how education is dependent on philosophy. Notable philosophers who have made significant contributions to education include Aurobindo Gosh, Gandhi, Radhakrishnan, Tagore, Plato, Socrates, Locke, Comenius, Rousseau, Froebel, and Dewey. Educational programs were a reflection of their philosophical beliefs. Thanks to Socrates, we have the first educational classic—Plato's Republic—and the "Socratic method" of teaching—a combination of asking and cross-questioning. The famous French philosopher Rousseau argued that schools should "follow nature.". Concerned about his nation's educational issues, American John Dewey worked hard to find solutions. Basic education may be traced back to Gandhi Ji. That "on the whole great philosophers have been great educationists" provides "if further agreement is needed to establish the fundamental dependence of education on philosophy," as Ross put it.

The Purusharthas, or the four aims of life (Dharma, Artha, Kama, and Moksha), were central to ancient Indian thought and informed educational practice. A person might be better prepared to follow the teachings of the scriptures and live a good life via education. Indian philosophy date back thousands of years. There is a natural inclination for people to wonder about India's rich educational history. There is a certain order to the revelations of knowledge, and the Vedas were at the top of that order. All subsequent revelations developed from them. [The term used to describe the educational system that originated in ancient India is the Vedic system. There is no other ancient educational system in the world that can compare to the one that emerged during the Vedic period. During the Middle Ages, the Buddhist educational system was the most prominent. Like other schools of thought, Buddhist education sprang from the dominant Brahmanical system of the time. The rise of Buddhism granted the common people the freedom to pursue education, while Brahmanical education had previously denied them this privilege. The monastic system was the way of education in Buddhism. The Buddhist sangh welcomed people of all social classes. Everything from goals to curricula to disciplinary

practices to the role of the educator to the education of women has been influenced by the pedagogical tenets of Eastern traditions. Also covered in this study are the educational legacies of Swami Vivekananda, Rabindranath Tagore, Mahatma Gandhi, and Shri Aurobindo.

Among the most impressive branches of Indian philosophy is Buddhism. It is a later development in Vedic philosophy. Buddhism was based on the rejection of several mainstream philosophical ideas held by Hindus [165]. Karma, the concept in a cause-and-effect link between past actions and their future consequences, is one of many shared philosophical ideas between Hinduism and Buddhism. Everything that happens is believed to have its roots in something that happened before. Both hold that emancipation (Moksha or Nirvana) and the eradication of all forms of Karma (good and negative) are the pinnacle of their respective philosophies. During the time from 200 B.C. to 200 A.D., Lord Gautam Buddha established the Buddhist educational system. Although he did dabble in philosophy, Gautam Buddha's main focus was on teaching and reforming ethical behaviour. The difficulties of living were his primary concerns. Since discussing metaphysical questions is intellectually risky and serves no ethical purpose, he steered clear of the subject. The two most pressing issues about pain, he said over and over again, were how to end it and what steps to take in that direction. That is how the four Noble Truths came to be: the realisation that Buddha sought to impart to all living things. Here are four timeless truths: People are going through pain. A source of pain exists. The anguish has ended. Finding relief from pain is possible. The following eight tenets form the basis of Buddhist philosophy and the path to nirvana (liberation from suffering): Right Determination (Samyak Sankalpa) and Right Faith (Samyak Dristi) Satyagraha means "right speech," "samyak karmanta" means "right action," and "samyak ajiva" means "right living." "Right Concentration," "Right Thought," and "Right Effort" are the three tenets of yoga.

Buddhist Thought on Education All people were offered education by Buddhists. The Buddhist educational system attracted many students. The Buddhist movement was the first to significantly institutionalise education in India. There is historical evidence that prominent worldwide educational institutions like as Nalanda, Takshashila, Vikramshila, Ballabhi, Odantapuri, Nadia, Amravati, Nagahalla, and Saranath emerged with the entrance of the Buddhist era. Viharas and Sanghas were the primary places of learning during the time of the Buddha.

A fundamental tenet of Hinduism is Dharma, which is seen as everlasting and as the revelation of God's will. Dharma is the quality that sets humans apart from other animals, according to Indian tradition. Its personality permeates every facet of human existence. Justice, equity, virtue, morality, nature, character, characteristic quality, a specified course of behaviour, a duty, an ordinance, a law, use, practice, custom, and the customary observances of castes are all things that the word has been used to denote in different situations. Although the many definitions of the word seem to be at odds with one another, they are really all based on the same premise. The concepts of spirituality, reality of life, and consistency are central to this

approach. Coming from the root *dhṛ*, meaning "to hold, to support, to nourish," the term Dharma means both "to hold" and "to nourish," which is essentially the same meaning as the word law. In its most accurate and comprehensive form, dharma refers to the characteristics that show the interdependent relationships between causes and their consequences. This basic meaning of the word "Dharma" is found in the oldest written texts, the Vedas. The term Dharma means "law" when seen from a conceptual perspective. This idea, which is the antecedent of Dharma in the Vedic tradition, is known as *Rta*. It is the ultimate truth (*satyam*) in metaphysics. Self (*Purusa*), which is considered an objective and impersonal rule by virtue of its nature and purpose, is considered the absolute. It is the basis for making sense of the universe's physical and moral features. Because of its fundamentally spiritual character, it brings balance and order to these two domains. In the physical cosmos, *Rta* is the driving force behind all kinds of events. The reality is that everything in the cosmos revolves around *Rta*. Justice and truth are represented by *Rta* in the moral realm. A person's merit (*punya*) or sin (*papa*) may be traced back to the idea of the *Rta* in Vedic tradition. In several Upanisads, Dharma is another name for *Rta*. Dharma (*Dharmatparamnasti*) is the highest principle. Within this framework, it is worth noting that there is a revered idea of *Deyam* (*Dadami Deyam*) that equates Dharma with paying off debt (*rna*). Triple debt, or *rnatraya*, is a profound ethical principle. The responsibility to settle three debts—*devarna*, *rsirna*, and *pitrna*—is innate to every human being. To fulfil one's Dharma obligations is to settle one's debts to one's community and to other people. Human activity is necessary to preserve both the cosmic and social order, according to this theory. Because it is commanded that each human ought to participate towards the upkeep of this cosmic order, the presence of these orders helps every person. An individual's contribution to the maintenance of social, natural, and cosmic orders might be characterised as their performance of Dharma.

Material wealth is what *Artha* is alluding to. One of the four aims of life, or *purusharthas*, in Hinduism is *artha*. As long as it abides by the rules of Vedic ethics, it is seen as a worthy objective. Meaning is also represented by *Artha*. Nothing happens in life without purpose. Although it does not celebrate poverty, Hinduism promotes frugality, simplicity, and detachment. The requirement of adhering to dharma while accumulating riches is also emphasised in Hinduism. 15.10.01 Why It Matters What We Want The purpose of *artha* is to facilitate rather than to achieve any particular goal. One was supposed to fulfil life's desires with one's money. The redemption of humanity depends on both spiritualism and materialism. It is unacceptable to get wealth by dishonest methods. *Artha* is the current educational goal in a vocational sense. Taking an attitude of dedication and accountability towards his task is essential. Money is essential, but it can't solve all of life's problems or make you feel completely safe. Instilling a sense of autonomy and freedom requires teaching people how to earn money. What does *Artha Economics* have to do with education? The market forces are taught to the students. It teaches children right from wrong. A knowledge of politics and how to use that knowledge to improve society is what we gain by studying political science. Business, entrepreneurship, and accounting are all concepts covered in commerce.

Kama represents the satisfaction of one's aesthetic goals. Now that you have saved up a little bit of money and are financially stable, the natural next step is to treat yourself to some niceties while still taking care of your obligations and satisfying your wants. We seek out sensory pleasures because we believe they will provide us that experience. These aspirations should encompass both this world and the next. On the other hand, desires needed to be socially acceptable. People were supposed to control their vile and evil urges.

In this context, "Kama" is the cultural goal of education, which is to help students form healthy wants, learn to appropriately satisfy those needs, and find appropriate ways to relax and unwind.

Moksha, which meaning emancipation or self-realization, is the pinnacle of human existence. This is the point at which one comes to know, on an inner level, that one's own Self is identical to the Supreme Self. Internal cosmic perception is what it is. It is the realisation that one's own Shiva and Shakti energies merge and flow together. Oneness with the cosmos, or Ekatvam, is what it's all about. We are no longer bound to the cycle of births and deaths once we attain the Moksha stage.

Contribution of Swami Vivekanand

Swami Vivekananda, who was born on January 12, 1863, in Calcutta, was a prominent Vedanta teacher, educator, social reformer, and prophet of India. His father, Vishwanath Datta, was an accomplished lawyer with interests in many fields; his mother, Bhuvaneshwari Devi, possessed many admirable traits, including unwavering loyalty and a strong character. Narendra shown exceptional talent in music, gymnastics, and academics from a young age. He had learnt a great deal about many things by the time he graduated from Calcutta University, but he had specialised in Western history and philosophy. His yogic disposition was evident from birth; he began meditating regularly as a young kid and was affiliated with the Brahmo Movement for a while. Critique is the kind and degree of his contribution to modern India's awakening. His work in educational theory is crucial if we consider education to be the most potent tool for social transformation. Training oneself is "the expression of perfection that is already in man," according to his definition. Physical, intellectual, emotional, moral, and spiritual development are all facets of a well-rounded education, which he believes should be an ongoing process. When it comes to modernisation, his stance is that widespread education should take precedence. By eliminating 1) priestcraft, 2) poverty, and 3) caste system, he hoped to rid India of four great ills. 3) lack of knowledge oppression by the knowledgeable. He made an effort to convey to the Indian people the idea that cultural strength should underpin social and political power. He has a genuine understanding of the cultural background of Indian educational thought. Due to contemporary education's disconnection from human life's ideals, his educational philosophy is more relevant than ever. Thus, he argued that the purpose of education should not be rote memorisation of information but rather the transformation of the

human intellect. To him, the true purpose of education was not to advance one's career but to have a positive impact on one's country. At the young age of 39, the renowned religious reformer and saint passed away in 1902. Even if he is no longer physically present, his legacy will go on in perpetuity. Generations to come will find inspiration in his missions and sermons.

Among modern Indian educational philosophers, Rabindranath Tagore stands head and shoulders above and beyond. One may argue that he is a humanist in the rigidest sense. The humanist perspective he holds is holistic rather than materialist. A direct outgrowth of his cosmopolitan humanist philosophy is his view of education. Tagore came into this world in Calcutta on May 6, 1861. Enlightened and progressive ideologies ran throughout Tagore's family. He had a private education in India before being transferred to England in 1877 to study law and become a barrister, but he went back to India rather quickly. With the Nobel Prize in Literature bestowed upon him in 1913 for his work "Gitanjali," Tagore becomes a globally recognised writer. Tagore established visabharati, an international university dedicated to bridging eastern and western perspectives, on December 22, 1921. Indelible marks of Tagore's influence may be seen in many areas of human endeavour, including the creative, cultural, academic, political, and social. As far as literature is concerned, he has made significant contributions to every area. Not only that, but he was also a brilliant educator, poet, social reformer, philosopher, and patriot.

Indian society is a heterogeneous and diverse not only in terms of religion, ethnicity, culture, but also it is a society which is highly stratified and unequal, where the division between the rich and the poor is immense. Today in the age of market and neo-liberalism we can see an organized attempt of destroying various government funded public institutions by celebrating massive privatization which is a severe attack on India's quest for egalitarian society. Today many branded fancy private learning institutions including schools have many under-ground stories of depression, anxiety, suicides and it represent everything that is black about our education system. Our schools have become merely certificate distributing legitimate agencies striving to exist with the market demands and that's why we see mushrooming growth of educational/coaching centres. Also, our education system or culture of schooling became primarily exam centric due to which qualitative and meaningful learning became less important. The fact is that some of the great things of life we learn not necessarily through formal creativity that includes examinations, ranking, etc. or within an institutional framework but learn from the real world or from our self-experience. In this context, Ivan Illich also said that we tend to believe of school as a modern church and no learning or education is possible without passing through that church. . The kind of education that promotes proximity with one's surroundings and nature can be seen in India during ancient times when the 'Gurukul system' was present. No tuition centres, private tutors, formal textbooks, failures, competition, percentages or grades exist, and no student suicide cases were reported. Unlike what exists today, earlier education was seen as a life-learning process and was unescapable from life. Due to the sudden change in our education system, which

is an integral part of the social domain, education philosophers felt it potent to analyze it. Here we discuss whether the prominent role of education is to transfer knowledge or it teaches critical thinking skills needed for developing autonomy. Therefore, in order to gain profound knowledge about Indian education system, it becomes important to look at the works of Indian philosophers who worked extensively in the field of education.

Rabindranath Tagore was a great philosopher in the field of education. He was a social reformer, visionary and renowned preacher of Indian tradition and culture. He immensely contributed to the education system of India. According to Tagore, the school must nourish children's minds in such a way so that they can see the world through a deeper sense of love. One can acquire knowledge in school, but fullness can be acquired only through sympathy. For Tagore, a good value-laden education should not only provide children with information but also teach them the essence and importance of living in harmony. Today, our school seems to be ignorant towards this sympathetic education, and they impart education in such a way where life's real essence gets lost. In turn, children also lose connectedness with nature. In this context, one can say that, in order to maintain discipline, the present education system separates individuals from their individuality. In his essay 'A Poet's School', Tagore shared his experience while being at school. He said, *"In the usual course I was sent to school, but possibly my suffering was unusual, greater than that of most other children. The non-civilized in me was sensitive: it had a great thirst for colour, for music, for the movement of life. Our city-built education took no heed of that living fact. It had its luggage-van waiting for branded bales of marketable result. The relative proportion of the non-civilized and civilized in man should be in the proportion of water and land on our globe, the former predominating. But the school had for its object a continual reclamation of the non-civilized. Such a drain of the fluid element causes an aridity which may not be considered deplorable under city conditions. But my nature never got accustomed to those conditions, to the callous decency of the pavement. The non-civilized triumphed in me only too soon and drove me away from my school when I had just entered my teens. I found myself stranded on a solitary island of ignorance, and had to rely solely upon my own instincts to build up an education for myself from the very beginning"* (Tagore, 1961, p. 53). Further, he discussed the difficulties he encountered with his type of education and said, *"For me the obstacles were numerous. The tradition of the community which calls itself educated, the parents' expectations, the up-bringing of the teachers themselves, the claim and the constitution of the official University, were all overwhelmingly arrayed against the idea I had cherished. ... in an education which takes count of the organic wholeness of human individuality that needs for its health a general stimulation to all its faculties, bodily and mental"* (Tagore, 1961, p. 59). He believed that, *"In educational organizations our reasoning faculties have to be nourished in order to allow our mind its freedom in the words of truth, our imagination for the world which belongs to art, and our sympathy for the world of human relationship"* (Tagore, 1961, p. 64).

He was among those philosophers working in the field of education who challenged the old believes or conventions. He believed that, Britishers enforced such an education system that made our children mere clerks in British offices and in this way they develop deep inferiority complex for their Indian philosophy and culture. This can also be understood from his famous essay 'The Parrot's Training'. In this essay, there was a King, who decided to teach one bird some manners because according to King the bird was ignorant. To begin with the bird's training, King appointed some Pundits in order to teach the bird and they constructed a golden cage. Pundits choked the bird's throat with some book pages to make the bird unable to whisper or whistle. Eventually, the bird could not crawl and flutter its wings; finally, that ignorant bird died.

This story depicts the plight of our education system, in a way, how it burdens children, focuses on information-centric ideals, and associates with discontent. Tagore was unsatisfied with this model and introduced his idea of Shantiniketan⁵, which offered ashram-style education and was free from British control. It was based on the principle of freedom, cooperation, joy and natural trust. With this innovative idea, Tagore wanted to recall his school days by liberating students from various kinds of frustrations which he experienced in his school. While discussing freedom in our education system, he viewed huge social walls between various castes that weaken our education system and cripples this principle of freedom. These huge walls manage or control people's feelings and make them devoid of respect and love. In this way, we Indians built our own cage with such a discriminatory model and get captivated by it. Here, 'Shantiniketan' was seen as the perfect model for developing Bengali textbooks and vernacular instructions. Also, it introduced various co- educational programs across South Asia.

In his essay "The Art of Movement in Education", Tagore explained the importance of movement in the education system. We all know that children express their feelings or emotions through their whole body. According to Tagore, we all take our initial false step when we enter the school because *"There we are required to think sitting. We mustn't move our arms. To our teacher we present so many masks. All the time we are forced to control those physical and parallel lines of movement that would be the natural accompaniment to our thoughts. Whenever, as children, we are stirred emotionally or feel receptive to thought, we need an appropriate accompaniment of physical movement"* (Tagore, The Art of Movement in Education, 1961, p. 103). In this way, *"Children can quite quickly acquire the habit of receiving thoughts sitting still. Their minds have then to think unaided by the collaboration of the body. The body, in its turn, feels neglected because it is not aiding its great partner, the mind, in its internal work. Our minds suffer ever after as a result"* (Tagore, The Art of Movement in Education, 1961, p. 103). Tagore also explained the importance of expressing oneself and how our present education system seems to be ignorant in making our children expressive which in turn disregards creative thinking.

"For creative work the mind acts as a co-ordinator of ideas, and we discover best by thinking and by expressing. When we try to express ourselves merely in words, we feel incomplete, and for the fullest expression there should certainly be arm and leg movement as well. The poet or the musician gesticulates as he works. He must move his arms or his hands, and wrinkle his face. Why, then, doesn't he start up from his chair and dance his ideas out in the sunshine? Because he's been to school. It is at school that he has learnt the habit of stifling so thoroughly the natural companionship of body and mind. His widowed body feels neglected, because he has lost the art of composing or of thinking whilst he is dancing or moving. The result is that in the whole body, which is designed for expression through movement, loses one of its most important missions in life, the urge to express. The body becomes feeble, and only the face retains some power and freedom to express through movement. As you think, you wrinkle your forehead. As you smile, or as you weep, each emotion is expressed in some movement of your face. But as a small child, you smiled with the whole of your body, you wept with every muscle you had, and in anger you beat with your feet upon the ground. The whole body expressed whatever emotion you felt deeply. This power and this freedom we have deliberately mutilated, and of both we have deprived our children" (Tagore, *The Art of Movement in Education*, 1961, pp. 103-104).

In order to make our children expressive, Tagore suggested that *"We must make dramatic performance a regular subject of education. Children need the opportunity to give expression of their sentiments through perfect and graceful movements of the body... So introduce the dramatic arts into your school from the beginning. This is the only way"* (Tagore, *The Art of Movement in Education*, 1961, p. 106).

Today's civilized communities seem to be ignorant towards what Tagore would emphasize: 'expression through movement'. According to Tagore, people should understand that they cannot separate body from mind because both are interconnected. Tagore was considered a great tutor because of his unique teaching style. He said, *"I would allow all our boys and girls during class to jump, even to climb into a tree, to run off and chase after a cat or dog, or to pick some fruit off a branch. This is really why my classes were preferred, not because I was any special good as a teacher. I tried to keep in mind the need of the child to use the whole of its body in acquiring a vocabulary and in mastering a whole sentence"* (Tagore, *The Art of Movement in Education*, 1961, p. 107). He also said, *"When we are ill, the doctor often advises a change of air. Then why not a change while we are well and in school? After the class was over, I made it a rule, the place must be changed for the next class. We would move from the shade of one tree to the shade of another. I insisted on a five minute break so that they could run and dissipate the obstructions of the mind"* (Tagore, *The Art of Movement in Education*, 1961, pp. 109-110). Thus, Tagore explains the aesthetics of education and learning. The aesthetics of learning is that we all learn about the world not merely through a formal rigid curriculum or through the ritualization of exams and grades, or in a formal caged like classroom. Learning is everywhere, and nature is a

great tutor or educator. In this context, Tagore wanted to explain the power of learning through relatedness, where we relate ourselves with the concepts or things we are learning and then that thing became an educator for us. He believed that, *"Nature made a perfect adjustment between the body and the mind. It is civilized man who, by his formalism in the classroom, has caused dissension between the two of them, who has severed the connection and made the gap as wide as possible. But body and mind are indissolubly connected. The most natural form of healing is that which takes place through the suggestion of the mind. We are at last coming to accept this idea. Civilization has built up the barrier between the two, and it is our task to break down this gap and to open up once again the natural passage-ways between the two. The Greeks were probably aware of the need for this interrelation, for they cultivated a perfect harmony of body and mind. They linked teaching with music and with games"* (Tagore, The Art of Movement in Education, 1961, pp. 110-111).

Mahatma Gandhi was another influential Indian educational philosopher. While discussing education, he questioned why one wants to be educated. The following two aspects influence educational philosophy:

- First is what type of society and people one desires, whether a non-violent society ever exists and how one will impart specific values in the present education system as a part of this violent environment. Undoubtedly, education can build one's career and help one achieve their goals, but will this education bring a non-violent society as aspired by various philosophers? In this context, it became important to investigate what type of society as well as individual Gandhi aspired for. Moreover, it is equally important to analyze the kind of education our leaders and government have legislated and whether it is implemented accordingly; otherwise, the education system will never achieve its desired goals.
- Second is whether our education system makes one understand the contemporary political, moral, economic and social problems and subsequently provides solutions for them.

These two aspects are important for understanding Gandhian educational philosophy.

To answer the first aspect as per Gandhian educational philosophy regarding his aspiration for a specific type of society and individual, he always wanted that individual as well as society to live within their 'Swaraj'. He distinguished between individual's Swaraj and society's Swaraj. He fought for independence from British control and to establish parliamentary democracy not only to make India free but to make India capable of moving with its society and individuals towards their own Swaraj. Although the parliamentary democracy could not lead society and individuals towards Swaraj, it became important to comprehend Gandhi's desired aims towards the educational process. He called this entire understanding of Swaraj, whether individual or societal, as 'Gram Swaraj'.

There exist some specific tenants to live within Swaraj. According to Gandhi, one should

be economically and self-independent if one wants to live in Swaraj. If one creates violence and hurdle in Swaraj, it creates injustice within Swaraj. Gandhi talked about 'Satyagraha' in order to come out from these hurdles. If education provides training to individuals to build our nation as well as culture, then for Gandhi the primary aim of education should be to train individuals and society towards Swaraj. As per the Gandhian educational philosophy, education is needed in order to achieve the desired aim of Swaraj. There exist two ways through which Swaraj can be achieved:

- One, by making individuals economically independent
- Second, by providing training to individuals so that they can contest against any kind of injustice in a just way

Thus, 'Satyagraha' and 'Swaraj' are the two important programs or drivers of Gandhian education. According to Gandhi, one cannot defeat a 'satyagrahi' until and unless a satyagrahi himself accepts his defeat. In the 'Hind Swaraj', Gandhi defined Swaraj as a rajya or state of an individual's own mind where Satyagraha, kind heartedness as well as self-confidence are its tools. Here people should be kind hearted because if they do not understand the situation of others and injustice caused against them, then they may not also contest against the injustice they encounter. People usually fight for themselves, but by incorporating the sense of kindness, they may fight against the injustice caused to others, which ultimately inspires them towards Satyagraha.

Gandhi believed that it was important to accept Swadeshi completely as Swadeshi as a part of the Satyagraha process to hold Satyagraha's power. By rejecting the English language, he considered 'Swa-Bhasha', which is one's own language, as an important part of what he called Swadeshi because, without it, society, as well as individuals, cannot imagine Swadeshi's practical aspects. Language cannot be considered only as a means of communication because it also helps one understand and know one's culture. Moreover, 'Swa-Bhasha' does not only indicate Hindi language or constitutionally recognized languages; it also includes various other local languages that represent different cultures existing in our country. Today, numerous local languages advocated or spoken by Adivashi groups and various other local areas have gradually become extinct in India, and now nobody speaks these languages. The extinction of any language does not only lead to cultural extinction but also the extinction of the knowledge system that is associated with that particular language. Here, one may question those who believe that there is nothing wrong in imparting education or teaching our children in a foreign language. To answer this, various scientific studies have shown the power and importance of the mother tongue in imparting and acquiring knowledge. For Gandhi, lessons of geography or history can be learnt in relatively less time if conveyed in one's own mother tongue. Here the question of education must be revisited again to find out what kind of society we all want. Education should work towards a child's mental, moral and physical development and the overall or integrated personality development. Also, Satyagraha is not possible without moral development. Gandhi was worried for the Indian elite group as they were developing a blind

faith towards the English language, which, in his view, was damaging India's education system. Thus, for him, the mother tongue should be the medium of teaching or instruction within educational institutions, as self-reflection is possible only through one's own language. *"The foreign medium has caused brain fag, put an undue strain upon the nerves of our children, made them crammers and imitators, unfitted them for original work and thought and disabled them for filtering their learning to the family or the masses. The foreign medium has made our children practically foreigners in their own land. It is the greatest tragedy of the existing system. The foreign medium has prevented the growth of our vernaculars. If I had the powers of a despot, I would today stop the tuition of our boys and girls through a foreign medium, and require all the teachers and professors on pain of dismissal to introduce the change forthwith"* (Gandhi, 1953, p. 54).

According to Gandhi, in a healthy society, one can witness cooperation between the societal members in place of competition. Competition may bring jealousy and violence, which in turn create an unhealthy society, but cooperation always comes with happiness and joy in one's life. If there exists any clash between the hidden and the declared agenda, then for Gandhi, the education system must work towards the hidden agenda by neglecting the declared agenda.

According to Gandhi, one should integrate this 'learning by doing' concept in our education system via curriculum as it imparts practical knowledge to the children in order to make them innovative. The transmission of experimental knowledge and ethical learning is vital for the Indian education system and society. Besides encouraging experimentation in the school curriculum, Gandhi promoted culturally rooted curriculum that engages with people's lives. He doesn't want this new education to become the imported product of Cambridge and Oxford because India has a different, established and elaborated civilization. *"Almost from the commencement, the text books (today) deal, not with things the boys and the girls have always to deal with in their homes, but things to which they are perfect strangers. It is not through the textbooks that a lad learns what is right and what is wrong in the home life. He is never taught to have any pride in his surroundings. The higher he goes, the farther he is removed from his home, so that at the end of his education he is estranged from his surroundings. He feels no poetry about the home life. The village scenes are all a sealed book for him. His own civilization is presented to him as imbecile, barbarous, superstitious and useless for all practical purposes. His education is calculated to wean him from his traditional culture... If I had my way, I would certainly destroy the majority of the present text books and cause to be written textbooks which have a bearing on and correspondence with the home life, so that a boy as he learns may react upon his immediate surroundings"* (Gandhi, 1953, p. 31). Moreover, for Gandhi, this cultural rootedness is possible only with the teacher's lively touch or presence and not only through books.

Through education, individuals search for their inner selves, making education a part of a lifelong journey. Within one's self, there always exists inner sound. If one listens to that sound while entering society, then one may actually call themselves educated and trained. One message that can be exemplified from Gandhi's life journey was that one can become successful in real terms only when one makes oneself free from false pride. Knowledge will enter into one's mind only when one leaves pride behind. One needs to undertake a spiritual journey if one wants to find out their inner self and an individual's actual religion lies above various worldly existing religions. In this context, religion ties people together. Gandhi said that when people do something with their hands, that enters their hearts, which in turn helps in knowledge production. In this context, when the teacher teaches only through books, then that teaching is not very fruitful, but when teaching provides students space to internalize contemporary issues and challenges, then only students start learning in the true sense.

Sri Aurobindo was another important philosopher in the field of education in India. His view on education is primarily centred on values, and the famous 'integral educational philosophy' was propagated by him. His philosophy of education takes into account both Western and Eastern thoughts, and on this basis, his ashram, which is 'Aurobindo Ashram' located in Pondicherry, is, considering every aspect of education to come up with the ideal system. He states, "*Man is a microcosm in the macrocosm, and society is an enlargement of the individual*" (Aurobindo, 1950, p. 105). For him, the difference between animals and man is grounded by the human being's superior abilities with a possibility that outstrips the restricted physical, mental and vital being. Only through education, this transformation is possible. His educational philosophy is grounded on three core principles.

First, the teacher should only be a guide for helping students and children should develop and know. It is recommended for all children regardless of their sex and age. "*The first principle of true teaching is that nothing can be taught. The teacher is not an instructor or task maker; he is a helper and a guide. His business is to suggest and not to impose. He doesn't actually train the pupil's mind, he only shows him how to perfect his instruments of knowledge and helps and encourages him in the process. He does not call forth the knowledge that is within; he only shows him where it lies and how it can be habituated to rise to the surface. The distinction that reserves this principle for the teaching of adolescent and adult minds and denies its application to the child, is a conservative and unintelligent doctrine*" (Aurobindo, A New Education for a New Consciousness, 1992, p. 119).

Second, education should suit students' capacities, virtues, qualities and ideas. In this context, every group, community and individual should have an education system that suits their nature. Here, the basic idea is that everyone must follow their Swadharma education that helps grow one's soul to bring out the best and make it flawless. "*Mind has to be*

consulted in its own growth. The idea of hammering the child into the shape desired by the parents or teachers is barbarous and ignorant superstition. It is he himself who must be induced to expand in accordance with his own nature. There can be no greater error than for the parent to arrange beforehand that his son shall develop particular qualities, capacities, ideas, virtues, or be prepared for a prearranged career. To force the nature to abandon its own dharma is to do it permanent harm, mutilate its growth and deface its perfection...The chief aim of education should be to help the growing soul to draw out that in itself which is best and make it perfect for a noble use" (Aurobindo, A New Education for a New Consciousness, 1992, p. 120).

Thirdly, educational principles must operate *"from the near to the far, from that which is to that which shall be... We must not take up the nature by the roots from the earth in which it must grow or surround the mind with images and ideas of a life which is alien to that in which it must physically move. If anything has to be brought in from outside, it must be offered, not forced on the mind. A free and natural growth is the condition of genuine development"* (Aurobindo, A New Education for a New Consciousness, 1992, pp. 120-121).

Thus, for him, true education should not aim to take us towards contemporary knowledge and truth but to consider our own minds, spirit and beliefs. His educational scheme includes education of one's body, mind, and senses and both religious as well as moral education. According to him, children's education starts from the age of seven or eight. The teacher guide, absorb and interact with students until they master the subject, and this is the real art of teaching. *"The teacher should not be a book that is read aloud, the same for everyone, no matter what his nature and character. The first duty of the teacher is to help the student to know himself and to discover what he is capable of doing...The old method of the seated class to which the teacher gives the same lesson for all, is certainly economical and easy, but also very ineffective and so time is wasted for everybody"* (Aurobindo, A New Education for a New Consciousness, 1992, p. 124).

During the early stage of child education, the schooling process must provide training of senses to children by engaging with the process of mental development with the help of senses of touch, sight, smell, taste, hearing, etc. To eliminate such obstructions that emerge within the senses in the yoga tradition, one suggests practicing Nadi Suddhi Pranayama to regulate one's breathing. This minimizes one's emotional difficulties and assists in the adequate working of the senses. Also, controlling one's mind becomes equally important as Sri Aurobindo focuses on the mind's concentration in order to attain knowledge. Every child must watch, observe and analyze things in their surroundings through their senses attentively, systematically and succinctly. This process must continue until the child fully understands or becomes familiar with the object. Teachers should encourage students' capacities, including judgement and retention, by developing their concentration on the concept so that children can contrast and compare objects as well as

sense them logically. During the initial phase of the schooling process, observation becomes a basic tool or mechanism for children learning. Thus, for Sri Aurobindo, there exists no perfect scientific subject, and during the early phase of childhood, natural mastery is done through training of the abilities to compare, observe, judge and remember various categories of objects.

Sri Aurobindo also talked about moral education and marked it as necessary. It involves training one's moral facilities, that is child's ability to decide what is wrong and right. Moral textbooks can develop artificial or mechanical moral thinking. On the other hand, the moral nature of human beings largely comprises abstract things, including emotions, temperament and impressions. Thus, children cannot become moral until these morals get transformed. Although books help to improve one's intellectual ability, they do not integrate emotions. Repression and discipline within the school cannot inject morality among students. Children must understand the benefit of discipline within the school as it helps create better citizens. Thus, the fundamental aim of education and schooling is good learning as well as living through an unrestricted or free approach. Mother called this approach as 'free progress', which is guided by one's soul and should not concern with preconceived ideas, conventions and habits. With the help of this approach, every child must be taught to give their best in whatever they do, whether manual work, artistic work or intellectual work and do it with joy by respecting every work.

In the era of disillusioned humanity and scepticism, some new hopes were held in Auroville, which according to Mother, is a kind of living laboratory where one can perform new experiments. The mother dreams of a place on the earth where human beings gather themselves to evolve as good citizens belonging to one world created by divine consciousness.

The book "Krishnamurti on Education" becomes important if one wants to understand the educational thoughts of **J. Krishnamurti**. This book also covers the dialogic communication held between Krishnamurti and students of both 'Rajghat School' located in Varanasi and 'Rishi Valley School' at Andhra Pradesh, as Krishnamurti Foundation in India runs these schools. These schools were set up to impart the teachings of J. Krishnamurti to children. According to Krishnamurti, education is *"of prime significance in the communication of that which is central to the transformation of the human mind and the creation of a new culture. Such a fundamental transformation takes place when the child, while being trained in various skills and disciplines, is also given the capacity to be awake to the processes of his own thinking, feeling and action. This alertness makes him self-critical and observant and thus establishes an integrity of perception, discrimination and action, crucial to the maturing within him of a right relationship to man, to nature and to the tools man creates"* (Krishnamurti, p. 3). For him, two instruments are available with human beings, *"the instrument of knowledge which enables him to gain mastery over technical skills, and intelligence which is born of observation and self-knowing"*

(Krishnamurti, p. 4). Here, Krishnamurti believes that education has the fundamental task of discovering those areas where technical skills and knowledge are necessary as well as where they are harmful or irrelevant. For him, only when the mind locates the importance of areas where knowledge becomes irrelevant, entirely new dimensions are realized, the human mind's unused potentialities are activated, and new energies are generated.

Educationists' worldwide faced challenges and unsolved problems related to order and freedom. Here, the question arises: how can a child grow with freedom and develop a profound sense of inner order? *"Order is the very root of freedom"* (Krishnamurti, p. 4). For Krishnamurti, freedom *"has no terminal point but is renewed from moment to moment in the very act of living"* (Krishnamurti, p. 4). Here, observing the entire schooling process becomes potent to investigate how children will rise in 'freedom' by developing a more profound sense of 'order'. By following this view, he advised people working at the administrative level in his school not to get inclined towards the isolated structure of educational institutions in order to become enclosed from self and the world. He strongly advised everyone not to get turned into a 'community' because a community needs to describe itself to build a boundary, and such boundaries exclude people who do not fall or fit within the defined boundary. He wanted the doors of his school to remain open for everyone as huge walls and closed doors demonstrate exclusive ideals, various classes and existing caste biases, and these all are usually put together in order to compare and dominate others. To answer this question of how one should live, Krishnamurti always used to say that 'the world is in you'. According to him, life has a wider importance, and with the help of proper schooling and education, it creates efficient and knowledgeable individuals who are free from conflict, division, fear, jealousy, anxiety, envy, violence, prejudice, etc. He wants the entire world to be free of war, division, poverty, exploitation, misery and injustice. For him, such a world is possible only with the help of proper education, which can make a new, better world order where only some individuals do not dominate. While talking with students at 'Rishi Valley School' in Andhra Pradesh, and Krishnamurti said, *"You know, you live in one of the most beautiful valleys I have seen. It has a special atmosphere. Have you noticed, especially in the evenings and very early mornings, a quality of silence which permeates the valley? There are around here, I believe the most ancient hills in the world and man has not spoilt them yet; and wherever you go, in cities or in other places, man is destroying nature, cutting down trees to build more houses, polluting the air with cars and industry. Man is destroying animals; there are few tigers left. Man is destroying everything because more and more people are born and they must have more space. Gradually, man is spreading destruction all over the world. And when one comes to a valley like this – where there are very few people, where nature is still not spoilt, where there is still silence, quietness, and beauty – one is really astonished. Every time one comes here one feels the strangeness of this land, but probably you have become used to it. You do not look at the hills anymore; you do not listen to the birds anymore and to the wind among the leaves. So you have gradually become indifferent"* (Krishnamurti, p. 6). Thus, for him, education does

not only mean learning from selected books and memorizing some specific facts; it involves learning how to listen to what books are trying to convey and also to find out whether the books are conveying true or false knowledge. He said education is not about just passing examinations, get a job or a degree, and to get married or settle down; instead, education is about making one able to see the open sky, to observe the extraordinary shape and beauty of the hills, to feel and get in touch with our own environment. In this context, Krishnamurti ask children that, the society wants and tries to fit you all into specific value patterns that are guided by money, prestige, position and power. He wants children *"to think, to observe, to learn, not from books, but learn for yourself by watching, listening to everything that is happening around you, you will grow up to be a different human being – one who cares, who has affection, who loves people"* (Krishnamurti, p. 7).

Krishnamurti believed that, while learning within or outside the school's classroom, 'attention' becomes very important and regarded 'attention' as extraordinary. He said, *"Attention is something different from concentration. When you concentrate, you don't see everything. But when you are paying attention, you see a great deal"* (Krishnamurti, p. 8). If children were asked to concentrate on a tree, then they would just watch that tree. But if they pay attention, then they *"Look at that tree and see the shadows, the slight breeze among the leaves. See the shape of the tree. See the proportion of the tree in relation to other trees. See the quality of light that penetrates through the leaves, the light on the branches and the trunk. See the totality of the tree"* (Krishnamurti, p. 8). Similarly, if children pay attention while learning, they will critically indulge in the whole process of learning. So, while paying attention to the 'basics of education', one may ask why it is important to get educated. Why do children go to school? What is education in the true sense? To answer these questions, Krishnamurti said, *"Human beings throughout world ... are being educated to conform, to fit into society and into their culture, to fit into the stream of social and economic activity, to be sucked into the vast stream that has been flowing for thousands of years. Real education means that a human mind, your mind, not only is capable of being excellent in mathematics, geography and history, but also can never, under any circumstances, be drawn into the stream of society. Because that stream which we call living, is very corrupt, is immoral, is violent, is greedy. That stream is our culture"* (Krishnamurti, p. 9). In this context, one can say that education's real intention and meaning is that one should never learn to accept anything without critically analyzing it. Jiddu Krishnamurti delivered a famous speech known as "Truth is a pathless land" and he said that, *"no fix organization, no institutionalized religion, no fix dogma can take one closer to truth. Instead to be closer to truth is to take a journey and it's an endless journey and a pathless land. It is like walking into a deep wild forest"*. Hence, truth is a pathless land that means one is a constant wanderer and no fix ideology and dogma take us to the truth. He also said that quite often we carry the burden of fixed knowledge or memory and it condition our mind. In this context, the question arises whether we are seeing our school, university or college as a learning space or whether our act of seeing education has already been conditioned by a

memory that from generations we have inherited. According to Krishnamurti, if people learn never to conform then they will live a happy, extraordinary and beautiful life. Otherwise, they would remain 'ordinary'. For Krishnamurti, 'ordinary' means *"to be like the rest of men; with their worries, with their corruption, violence, brutality, indifference, callousness. To want a job, to want to hold on to a job, whether you are efficient or not, to die in the job. That is what is called ordinary – to have nothing new, nothing fresh, no joy in life, never to be curious, intense, passionate, never to find out, but merely to conform. That is what I mean by ordinary. It is called being bourgeois. It is a mechanical way of living, a routine, a boredom"* (Krishnamurti, p. 12).

Hence, Jiddu Krishnamurti explained the importance of education in contemporary times, where young minds are going away from reflexive thinking and sensitivity. His writings are essential for those who wish to understand how education can promote change in society and individuals and how it also gives individuals the capacity to transform their social lives. He was primarily worried for society because values were decaying by instituting the principles of selfishness and profit, by destroying nature through unfair means, including corruption and promoting violence; still, his profound belief in human potential directed his views on education. Today, one can experience how the notion of mindfulness got replaced by technocratic knowledge, which made life mechanistic with the absence of empathy. He suggested that education should start by teaching young minds about life, its values and meaning. Then, it should make children committed and aware of their goals without being self-centered, and finally, it should help to protect their lives, including their surroundings, nature and subalterns. In this way, education should work towards transforming the society in a better way.

Contemporary Perspective on Education and Schooling

It becomes crucial to look at some contemporary works and perspectives after looking at education and schooling from the functionalist, Marxist, Post-Modernist and Indian Philosophical standpoints. Understanding the contemporary perspective will enable us to examine where these above-discussed views stand today. Durkheim focused on the notion of collectiveness or togetherness and on constructing the collective moral consciousness in the book *Sociology of Education*. For Max Weber, education should cultivate 'conduct of life' for students because, for him, it will lead to the conduct of status groups. Similarly, Karl Mannheim argued that the educational process is dynamic in today's changing society, though human engagement and involvement are always present. For him, education should prepare individuals to conform and, secondly, to have the scope and opportunity for individuality as it's a democratic society. Thus, for Mannheim, education prepares individuals for both the process of change and societal adjustment. Another influential philosopher John Dewey advocated the concept of 'progressive' education as he emphasized on the child's experience within the educational process. His approach was primarily concerned with a 'child-centered' educational process through 'activity-based learning' or

'learning by doing'. For him, education can perform the crucial social function of making children responsible citizens of a democratic society. For Dewey, 'experience' is important to learning in this context. Coming to Marxist perspective, for scholars like Althusser, education is not neutral. The institution of education is unbiased as it supports the reproduction of societal values and norms. For him, education serves the state interest by performing the function of an 'ideological state apparatus' instead of a 'repressive state apparatus'. For Post-modernist scholars like Michael Foucault, school creates 'docile bodies' by exercising disciplinary power over students. Indian philosophers like Rabindranath Tagore, J. Krishnamurti, Sri Aurobindo and Mahatma Gandhigave alternation perspectives on schooling and education. For them, education is through life and is meant for life.

To start with the contemporary position on power, education and schooling, scholars like **Meenakshi Thapan** become important. Thapan was a professor of sociology at the Delhi School of Economics and retired in 2019 from the department. She worked extensively in the field of sociology of education and is still working and contributing to the field. According to her, *"Education is, first and foremost, concerned with the human subject. It is the goal of education, as an idea and as practice, through educational processes, to fashion, mould, and train the human subject. Such training involves the teaching of skills and techniques, how to read and write, numbers, theories, all of which constitute 'knowledge' in one form or another"* (Thapan, Introduction: Understanding Education - Ideas, Practice, and Outcomes, 2015, pp. 2-3). While talking about schools, she explained that both secondary and elementary schools offer a significant intellectual and physical space within which onedisseminates and receives knowledge. She said, *"The school, however, is not merely abuilding where information and technical skills are learnt, some social skills inculcated, examinations conducted, and students assessed, evaluated, and eventually certified. It is also that moral and symbolic space where socialization takes place; where identities are constructed and differentiated on the basis of gender, caste, class, race, and ethnicity, among others; where young minds follow well-trodden paths of learning, memorizing as well as challenging the given limits of knowledge; and where peer cultures are formed, exist, and tend to shape everything that takes place in school"* (Thapan, 2015, p. 3). Thapan extensively talked about 'education for socialization', which is an important aspect of education that includes the socialization of children into the values and norms of society. For her, *"Education as socialization is actually about how the 'self' is constituted in relation to the world, and how school reproduces society through the organization and content of thecurriculum and through discursive modes of interaction and communication. This is the central motif of the idea of education: the processes in educational practice that result in the constitution of the self. The study of education provides us with an understanding of the manifold processes at work within the space of the school, the peer group, and the communitythat are all engaged in the process of constructing the self. The school, therefore, is a hub notonly for different kinds of activity but also a space where relationships of different kinds are constructed, constituted, maintained, contested, or*

celebrated. There is, first, a relationship to knowledge, to the written text, to ideas, and their limits; to peers, teachers, and other school personnel; and to the entire assemblage of activities, events, and emotions that constitute the daily life of the school" (Thapan, 2015, pp. 3,4).

Meenakshi Thapan was sent to boarding school when she was just eleven. We all know that boarding schools offer an alienated experience for students with the absence of family and with very few friends. While sharing her school experience, Thapan said, *"My primary experience of schooling was one of loss, of complete emotional and familial loss"* (Thapan, School Experience: An Autobiographical Approach, 2014, p. 338). Thapan also shares the experience of other authors in her work. One among them shared her life experience at boarding school and said, *"The early months were physiologically and emotionally excruciating as much as they were rich with new possibilities of starting afresh, making new friends, just being alive in the beautiful setting that was the school. I understand that it was the unfamiliarity of the place, and the community, the new world that I had stepped into that was unsettling. Waking up every day in the morning in an unexpected place left me floundering a little"* (Thapan, School Experience: An Autobiographical Approach, 2014, p. 339). It tells us that this unfamiliarity of place, people, and environment produces the emotional experience of insecurity, vulnerability and loss. Here, the job of schools is to create a nurturing environment that should be based on affection, equal partnership and care. One may have seen children crying when they were first sent to school (both day and boarding schools). Thus, this emotional experience of insecurity and loss is experienced by all children, even at day schools. Still, boarding school children face the absence of affection and warmth of family. Moreover, all schools employ disciplinary tactics to control students. Thapan reported, *"It was an all girls' school and all students had to wear a clean, neatly ironed uniform, hair had to be combed and plaited, nails clipped short, no jewellery or ribbons and shoes polished. The overall picture that was to be presented was of complete discipline, from clothes, hair, shoes, nails, to demeanour which of course had to be submissive and respectful, conveying intelligence without too much independence or fearlessness. There was a sense in which the school completely took over one's embodied self and sought to control one's soul"* (Thapan, School Experience: An Autobiographical Approach, 2014, pp. 339-340). In this way, schools never encourage independence to express one's views and author said that, *"my report card sent home inevitably stated, 'She tends to be opinionated and has the habit of answering back' or that 'She is very argumentative'"* (Thapan, School Experience: An Autobiographical Approach, 2014, p. 340). In this context, it can be said that school celebrates passivity and submission in order to socialize children into the dominant culture. In this way, through strict discipline, all schools, including government, private, boarding and others, instill a culture of obedience. According to Thapan, *"This culture of strict disciplining is an outcome of the expectation that the 'educated' child or young adult must embody all the virtues of humanity and be rigorously schooled to do so"* (Thapan, School Experience: An Autobiographical

Approach, 2014, p. 342). Thus, power is exercised within a school through disciplinary control over students' bodies, resulting in 'docile bodies' as said by Michael Foucault. Subsequently, children are expected to show their passivity and submissiveness towards their teacher. Thapan said, *"Teachers are considered the repositories of all knowledge, are to be respected and no questioning is tolerated. Any attempt to do so meets with further punitive measures. The effort of the school appears to be one of attempting to break the free and independent spirit of students to ensure that they are churned out of school well socialized into the norms and values of society"* (Thapan, School Experience: An Autobiographical Approach, 2014, p. 344).

Meenakshi Thapan wrote the book 'The Life at School: An Ethnographic Study' in 2006. This book highlighted the meaning of alternative education, which is such an educational process that exists outside the domain of traditional school set-up. An alternative educational setting is required wherever students fail to fit within the traditional set-up. An alternative educational approach aims to help students who fail to succeed within the traditional school set-up by offering different opportunities to them so that they may acquire education without any difficulty. In this book, Thapan used an ethnographic approach in order to present an alternative picture of the 'Rishi Valley School' located in the Indian state of Andhra Pradesh. This is a residential, co-educational public school founded by Jiddu Krishnamurti and run by his foundation that is 'Krishnamurti Foundation'. This book subjectively interprets life at Rishi Valley School and what life meant for teachers and students of that school for the time they used to spend there every day. According to Thapan, both teachers and students are important aspects of the schooling process. In this book, Thapan highlighted the existing dichotomy within the organization and process of Rishi Valley School, which is between the 'local orders' and 'transcendental orders'. Transcendental orders are influenced by Krishnamurti's alternative views about the world and are concerned with values, morals and the creation of a new human being via the process of transformation and self-knowledge. The local orders include the actual process of schooling and are concerned only with the reproduction and gathering of knowledge by transmitting educational knowledge. The culture of every school is based on norms and values, which are derived from discursive and organizational practices. Thapan explained that, apart from discursive and organizational practices, Rishi Valley School also practices Krishnamurti philosophical values, which makes it different from other schools. Value is recognized through organizational practice, features, and rituals of effervescence and challenge. Thus, all these elements together result in various activities, including the celebration of some ceremonies and rituals. Thapan explores the routinized ceremonies and rituals at Rishi Valley School as a part of its culture. The author explains the 'Asthachal' ritual that is performed during the evening at Rishi Valley School, where students stand outside over the hills and watch as well as experience the sunset. The author also explains how the annual school visits of Krishnamurti bring a 'mystical quality' to the Rishi Valley School. According to Thapan, Rishi Valley School is following the ideology of

Krishnamurti by challenging the traditional educational approaches, but it paradoxically engages with the formal system. Hence, after reading this ethnographic study of the Rishi Valley School, one may experience the clash of ideologies within the school; the result-oriented and competitive impulses among teachers as well as students sometimes go against the ideology of Jiddu Krishnamurti.

Michel Foucault and the Theory of Power/Knowledge

"Ideology" is "a notion that cannot be used without circumspection" (p. 118), according to Foucault (1980).⁷ "Like it or not, [the concept] always stands in virtual opposition to something else which is supposed to count as truth" (p. 118), which is an argument against the critical use of the term, not its descriptive one. The idea that "knowledge can exist only where the power relations are suspended" is incorrect, in his opinion; rather, power and knowledge are interdependent. His argument is as follows: Maybe we should stop thinking that giving up power is a prerequisite for enlightenment. It is more accurate to say that power implies knowledge, and that knowledge in turn implies power. On page 27, Foucault states: The "politics of truth" that Foucault describes as his issue deals with "the effects of power and the production of 'truth'" (p. 157), according to Foucault (1980). (By drawing a comparison between his situation and the ideological dilemma, which he cleverly dubs the "economics of untruth.") By introducing the idea of discourse, which is "neither true nor false" (p. 118), Foucault paves the way for a new sort of inquiry on knowledge questions, namely a historical investigation into "how effects of truth are produced within discourses" (p. 118). "Truth" is best understood, in his opinion, as "a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements." This system is "linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it," he adds. A "regime of truth" (p. 133) is what he calls this cyclical relationship and the power dynamics it upholds. Here it is important to clarify that Foucault does not imply that truth does not exist due to the power-knowledge nexus. This would be in line with the reasoning he challenges, which states that impartial information cannot be biased. The political philosopher Jon Simons (1995) clarifies that Foucault's claim regarding "the mutual constitution and enmeshment of power and knowledge" does not imply that "all human scientific truth... is untrue," but rather that "efforts to justify theories epistemologically cannot be disentangled from their political effects" (p. 92). There is no reason to doubt the veracity of claims made regarding humans only because "the relation between legitimate power and scientific truth is intense, constant, and highly organised" (p. 44). That is to say, a thorough evaluation of Foucault's "antiscience" perspective is necessary. Research "has become institutionalised as a power" and "forces [one] to say certain things" (pp. 106-107), according to Foucault (1988).⁸ This point is made by Foucault in a clear and compelling way. His stance, however, does not appear to be as extreme as it initially appears. Rather than focussing on the sciences themselves, he examines how a society's subordination and dominance are impacted by the broader implications of scientific knowledge and its truths. This is not to defend "ignorance and non-knowledge" or to "deny knowledge," as Foucault

(1980) aptly describes "genealogy," his alternative approach to history, as "precisely antisciences." These impacts of centralised powers are associated with the establishment and operation of organised scientific discourse in our society, and they are met with what is referred to as "the insurrection of knowledges" (pp. 83-84). The idea is in line with what Foucault says about the intellectual's place in modern society: that they should "ascertain the possibility of constituting a new politics of truth" rather than "to ensure that his own scientific practice is accompanied by a correct ideology" or "to criticise the ideological contents linked to science" (Foucault, 1980, p. 133). The possibility of an ideologically neutral scientific community is not predicated on this. The point is to detach it from hegemonic forms—and, by extension, from counterhegemonic endeavors—rather than the other way around. Truth is already power, therefore emancipating it from all systems of power would be a chimaera. Instead, he argues, we must free truth's power from the social, economic, and cultural hegemony that it already works under. Based on Foucault (1980, p. 133) For critics who have positioned knowledge as ideology and who have endeavoured, with mixed success, to remake the sciences from the viewpoints of socially inferior groups, Foucault's approach may not be wholly original. I think Foucault deserves credit for (re)articulating the perspective in a way that makes sense in light of his ideas about the politics of truth and the regime of truth, which allows him to reframe the problem of hegemony.⁹ Whatever the case may be, the details of his suggestion for such "detaching" are likely where the theoretical tensions would manifest. Note that Foucault (1980) distinguishes between "erudite knowledge" and "local memories" as two forms of "subjugated knowledge" (pp. 81-83).¹⁰ The first is information that has been "buried" under what he terms "functionalist coherence" and "formal systemization" in the field of history studies, but which may be unearthed via rigorous critical analysis and scholarly investigation. The second category qualifies as "local, popular, disqualified knowledge," which refers to "a whole set of knowledges that have been disqualified [by science] as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated" (p. 82). As opposed to medical knowledge, his examples include the knowledges of the mentally ill, the sick person, the nurse, and the doctor. Genealogy relies on both scholarly research and anecdotal evidence from the area. We may develop a historical knowledge of conflicts and strategically employ this information now, according to Foucault (1980): "Let us give the term genealogy to the union of erudite knowledge and local memories" (p. 83). The (counter-hegemonic) necessity to unite the scientific facts with the knowledges, memories, and voices of the socially inferior is proposed by Foucault in this section. Several feminist and critical thinkers have tried to make a similar claim, so it's not completely original. However, as I'll explain below, there are some aspects of genealogical approaches that are novel due to their anti-essentialist orientation. On a more broad scale, his explicit (re)affirmation of the importance of intellectual knowledge within the framework of "antiscience," in opposed to the prevailing truth regime, is novel. While Foucault intends to connect it to the experiences and viewpoints of the socially inferior, his formulation does a good job of drawing attention to the inherent conflict between the two modes of knowing. Who, ultimately, would be the source(s) of information, and what would motivate them? John Fiske (1996) makes the observation that Foucault appears to think that "academics like himself" are the ones who can create a

genealogical history, or develop counter-[hegemonic] knowledges, and I agree with him. Even if we adopt Foucault's stance, we appear to be left with unresolved theoretical issues like the nature of knowledge, scientific method, and the role of determination. What's more, Foucault only promotes a particular kind of epistemology, and his own historical analysis includes truth claims, however complex. In Foucault's theory of power/knowledge, the theoretical conflicts associated with ideology resurface. When developing a curriculum with a certain idea in mind, how do these same tensions manifest? on what follows, I will analyse two ideas: first, Foucault's genealogy approaches to history, and second, R. W. Connell's case for counter-hegemonic curricular programs grounded on the perspective of the socially inferior.

Standpoint Theory and Counter- Hegemonic Curriculum Making

R. W. Connell asks, "What are our design principles for a school curriculum that will lead towards social justice?" in the first chapter of his 1993 book, *School and Social Justice*. His proposed solution involves "inverting hegemony" in order to "seek a way of organising [educational] content and method which builds on the experience of the disadvantaged" (p. 38). Using this tactic, educators may create counter-hegemonic curriculum that reflect the values and viewpoints of marginalised communities. The "standpoint theory" of knowing that Connell cites to back it up is an epistemology that essentially claims that one's lived experience is the foundation of knowledge. Specifically, according to Connell (1993), "the position of those who carry the burdens of social inequality" provides "a better startingpoint" than "the position of those who enjoy its advantages" when it comes to understanding society (p. 39). "At its most basic," he contends, "the perspective(s) of the socially subordinate group(s) supplies" "experiences and information not normally available to the dominant groups, and therefore overlooked or marginalised in their knowledge constructions" (p. 39). To rephrase, a counter-hegemonic curriculum that flips the script on hegemony would include the knowledge(s) of socially subordinate groups, whereas the conventional mainstream curriculum would leave them out. According to Connell, the second one is superior because it is "more comprehensive, truer to life 'as it really happened.'" A more balanced approach to teaching history in schools would be to broaden the focus beyond the actions of notable men and incorporate the experiences of socially marginalised groups, such as everyday people and women. Being able to put oneself in the shoes of someone who is socially inferior gives one "intellectual power" when it comes to building knowledge. Connell (1993) uses the perspective of the proletariat, citing Georg Lukacs, to illustrate his claim. As Lukacs argues, workers are able to get tangible insights into the mechanics of capitalist exploitation through their structural location, which is crucial for understanding the dynamics of class relations (Connell, n.d.). No matter how advanced their ideas are, philosophers' access to power in the capitalist system limits their perspectives. To get above these obstacles, we need the proletariat's perspective, which is based on their experience and actions. (page 40). While Lukacs argues that class relations can be understood through the proletariat's perspective, Connell (1993) argues that the same general idea—the intellectual power of standpoint held by the socially subordinate—applies to other types of social relations as well, including those based on gender, race, and sexual orientation.

His main argument is that while considering economic matters, they do so from the perspective of the poor, not the wealthy. We consider gender arrangements via a female lens. From an indigenous perspective, we analyse racial relations and land disputes. From the perspective of the LGBT community, we consider matters of sexuality. page 43 What this means is that different sorts of social connections call for different approaches when designing a counter-hegemonic curriculum. Across the board, "curricular justice" necessitates counter-hegemonic initiatives, according to Connell (1993). It affects all patterns of social inequality, according to Connell. Furthermore, "great diversity in what is undertaken" in practice would follow from such an outcome (p. 44). Anyone can understand and buy into Connell's reasoning. In my opinion, it has succeeded in establishing a strong guiding concept for counter-hegemonic curriculum creation, which sets it apart from previous texts with specific interests in this area. Having said that, even in his persuasive arguments, the theoretical conflicts (and problems) around knowing remain. The essentialist relationship between an individual's structural position and their knowledge is borne out, for instance, by the concept of standpoint(s). "The standpoint of women" is an example of this kind of thinking. The idea refers to the uniqueness or consistency of this perspective and the insights it provides. Nevertheless, "women" do not constitute an inherently homogeneous category. Therefore, the conclusions drawn from their deeds and experiences are not uniform and may even be at odds with one another. A matter of methodology for choosing and arranging knowledge(s) arises here: How can we pick and select which insights to use? Is the epistemological status of all "insights" uniform? Another question is how to make sense of information that seems to be at odds with itself. The issue of methodology is briefly and insufficiently addressed by Connell (1993). He is cautious not to equate "experience" with "knowledge," but he does imply that "an understanding of the central mechanisms producing a social structure is available through the experience of the groups subordinated by those mechanisms." The second option requires what he calls "constructive intellectual work," which marginalised communities might not have the resources to do. That this knowledge is "accessible" via a group's experience does not, in his view, imply that it is actually generated. It takes productive mental effort to produce and then generalise. And this is especially difficult for marginalised communities to undertake since, well, most of the resources necessary to conduct intellectual labour are owned by other people. page 41 For teachers in underprivileged schools, "the complicated issues that arise at this point are very lively ones," Connell adds. But Connell stops short of outlining the role that instructors may play or the complicated problems he anticipates. Quoted as saying, "[t]he task is complex and difficult, but possible" (p. 41), his response is straightforward. It appears that Connell (1993) is implying that educators have the power to shape and organise the knowledge of those who are socially disadvantaged.¹³ If he thinks the instructor can handle the "complex and difficult issues," it's not necessarily because he's an optimist. His faith in educators may have grown because of his work with them on many research initiatives involving classroom instruction.¹⁴ Still, it annoys me that he doesn't go into more detail about "the complex and difficult issues" and how educators should handle them; after all, the role(s) of intellectuals (in this instance, educators) is a central theoretical tension in the processes of knowledge production, selection,

and organisation. The way Connell (1993) discusses the connection between political conflicts and knowledge also presents some difficulty. "Social division and social power shape the production and distribution of knowledge," he says, "and the way knowledge is organised has social consequences" (p. 34), implying that curriculum is inherently political and social. Instead, counter-hegemonic curricular programs do not aim for the "political outcome," according to Connell. He says: In certain educational institutions, the political outcome has been the primary factor in deciding what students learn. This was the situation in the USSR, and now the extreme right is trying to force the same thinking on the country. This should not be allowed to happen because it would mean that scientific descriptions of the world, among other things, would no longer have an element of independent truth. page 45 My guess is that the last statement alludes to yet another conflict between "science and ideology," which some may find puzzling. Evidently cognisant of the theoretical problems he faces, Connell makes an intriguing reference to Foucault: A product of society, knowledge is... Social and even political concerns include: who knows what, about whom, and how it affects others. This is not to imply, as some sceptical epistemologists have done, that power determines whether or not truth remains an issue. Truth is often a disruptive force that undermines power/knowledge systems; I disagree with Foucault on this point. (If it weren't, governments and businesses wouldn't be putting so much effort into controlling information.) on page 109 Since "truth" is Foucault's first concern and because he argues that "playing the game(s) of truth" can be the sole means to "avoid... the effects of a domination" in some situations, he might have some disagreements with Connell's reading of his position (Foucault, 1991, p. 15). No matter how subtle or obvious they may be, Connell's curricular theory appears to be rife with theoretical conflicts and struggles; one can only speculate as to whether the theory would have been more useful had Connell provided greater elaboration. Some in his audience, including educators and curriculum developers, may have wanted to hear it because they deal with similar conflicts on a daily basis. A workable paradigm for creating curricula that challenges hegemony is presented by Connell (1993). His case is persuasive because it elucidates the concept of socially inferior viewpoints, its relevance to curriculum creation, and its connection to counter-hegemonic knowledges. But, at the very least, two big concerns emerge and need careful consideration, in my opinion. Problematically, the concept of perspective (of a certain group) practically always incorporates essentialism. Is it possible to get around it in Connell's curricular theory without compromising its clarity? In the other, we have the ongoing conflicts between epistemology and methodology. As much as Connell tries to alleviate the tensions, they persist. In this regard, it would be instructive to analyse Foucault's curriculum theory-based proposal for a genealogical study of history. While both Foucault and Connell are interested in the production, selection, and organisation of counter-hegemonic knowledge, Foucault differs from Connell in that he bases his argument on "anti-essentialism."

Genealogy as "Effective" Curriculum

Foucault uses the term "genealogy" in a number of his writings and interviews, but his 1977 essay "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" (Foucault, 1977, pp. 139-164) provides the most

detailed and comprehensive explanation of the concept. As a fresh perspective on the study of the past, Foucault proposes genealogy. His goal is not to completely reject historical research and historical thought as a whole, but rather to get beyond what he terms "the search for origins"—the underlying metaphysical and teleological tendencies in historical scholarship (p. 140). To him, searching for beginnings is "an attempt to capture the exact essence of things, their purest possibilities, and their carefully protected identities." "The existence of immobile forms that precede the external world of accident and succession" (p. 142) is assumed in this endeavour. This view, in his view, is nothing more than the historians' "faith in metaphysics" expanded upon. As an alternative, Foucault argues that we should look for "disparity" (differences) at the very beginnings of historical events (p. 142). On page 144, it is said that in order to identify "disparity" one must first see such origins as "derisive and ironic, capable of undoing every infatuation" and then pay attention to the "vicissitudes of history," which are the many complexities, twists, and turns of the past. To further understand Foucault's argument, let's look at two examples of genealogy. It all starts with a look at "descent" (Herkunft). Although racial or socioeconomic type is typically considered in analyses of descent, Foucault argues that this just highlights the distinctions between individuals rather than their core identities: What it seeks to identify are not the unique genetic features of a person, emotion, or concept that allow us to classify them as "Greek" or "English"; rather, it is the subtle, singular, and sub-individual marks that may intersect in them to create a complex web that is hard to decipher. (page 145, 1977) Therefore, the quest for descent "dissociates the self," "disturbs what was previously considered immobile," "fragments what was thought unified," and "shows the heterogeneity of what was imagined consistent with itself" (p. 145), instead of locating or creating the picture of the original, cohesive identity. In a nutshell, it's about focussing on the diversity (differences) inside a unit or topic rather than its similarity (identity). The second genealogy that Foucault provides is an analysis of "emergence" (Entstehung). According to him, the study of emergence is best done by looking at how inconsistencies (such as competing interpretations) have arisen within certain historical processes rather than how they have progressed through time (the genesis). The analysis of social forces "must delineate... the struggle these forces wage against each other or against adverse circumstances, and the attempt to avoid degeneration and regain strength by dividing these forces against themselves" (1977, pp. 148-149), according to Foucault, since this is the only way that disparities like different interpretations can emerge. According to Foucault, "effective history" refers to the study of historical genealogy as opposed to "traditional history," which refers to the study of history as it is typically done. (In this context, "traditional curriculum" and "effective curriculum" would serve as a comparison.) First, there's the effort to see past events through the lens of "continuity"—that is, the persistence of the initial, cohesive core of things. "Dissolving the singular event into an ideal continuity... as [a] teleological movement or a natural process" (1977, p. 154), he says of conventional historical accounts, is their "theological" or "rationalistic" goal. Aiming to "[place] within a process of development everything considered immortal in man" (p. 153), effective history stands in opposition to this. Its goal is to demolish the concept of original unity by introducing "discontinuity" into history through the

historicization of things that are perceived as natural and eternal. To summarise, a well-written history "divides our emotions, dramatises our instincts, multiplies our body and sets it against itself" (p. 154). In addition to these key distinctions, effective history varies from conventional historical methods. It centres on the fact that history is complicated, multi-faceted, and seemingly random (as Foucault put it, the universe is "a profusion of entangled events"). Furthermore, it seeks to comprehend the broader narrative by delving into the tangible (e.g., the physical self, the neurological system, the food chain, digestion, and energies) rather than "a contemplation of distance and heights [such as] the noblest periods, the highest forms, the most abstract concepts, the purest individualities" (1977, pp. 155-156). Effective history, in contrast to conventional wisdom, may pay attention to the mundane, daily activities that are essential to comprehending the nature and operation of various power relations. Readers should now be aware that Foucault advocates for historical research that rejects essentialism. It may be used as a curricular theory since it is a theory for creating, choosing, and organising historical and genealogical information. Using a genealogy method, we can see the diversity, complexity, and incoherence of our ancestry, as well as the fights that have broken out because of these disparities. Keep in mind that essentialism is an issue for Connell's viewpoint theory, which seeks to create the knowledge(s) of the socially inferior. While both Foucault and Connell address the question of counter-hegemonic knowledge, Foucault takes a different tack—one that, in theory, has a lot of promise. Here we must go into the specifics of his genealogy approach, including their technique and procedures. This is in line with Foucault's (1977) theory of power/knowledge, which posits knowledge as viewpoint. Effective history, also known as genealogical history, is not trying to hide its biases and purposes but is instead "explicit in its perspective and acknowledges its system of injustice." A universal truth cannot be attained by the "will to knowledge," and this fact is made clear by the fact that all kinds of scientific awareness "are aspects of the will to knowledge." There is a "sacrifice of the subject of knowledge" that occurs during the process of expanding human understanding. Rather of building and affirming a powerless (or unfair) subject, the quest of knowledge actually leads to "the destruction" of such subject. Historians, according to Foucault, have a built-in contradiction in their conventional pursuit of objectivity (pp. 156–157, 160, 162-163). This is because, in order to invoke "objectivity," historians must initially conceal their own biases, preferences, and desire for knowledge. On the other hand, historians' claims of objectivity are what Foucault (1977) finds most problematic, rather than traditional historical methodologies. Actually, he thinks that current historical methods, or at least the branch of history that he refers to as the "historical sense" (following Nietzsche), can be a powerful tool for genealogical research if its essentialist or metaphysical tendencies are addressed (pp. 152-153). It is also possible, in his view, to apply the techniques and methodologies of traditional history to the study of genealogy. The former is sort of necessary for the latter to be mastered. I must study history so that I may put it to genealogical purposes, he says (p. 160). A fight for and within a set of rules (such as those of a science or the law) is also important, according to Foucault (1977). Rules, in his opinion, are "void in themselves, aggressive and unfinished; they are impersonal and can be twisted to any end." As a result, capturing them becomes crucial: Those

who can hijack these rules, supplant their abusers, or assume a new identity in order to twist and distort them will ultimately be the ones to claim credit for history's triumphs. (161 pages)15 Since an interpretation can only be achieved by adopting a system of rules (of a science), Foucault argues that the formation of competing interpretations signifies the clash of forces (and the reversal of their relationships in the play of dominances). To review, Foucault does not oppose science (or "anti-history" in this context), but he does believe that the power of science must be "detach[ed]" from the current hegemony; he also believes that genealogy is the coming together of scholarly knowledge with local recollections. Foucault consistently argues that science plays a crucial role in counter-hegemonic efforts. Nonetheless, this is not to say that theoretical tensions do not exist. Consider one of the theoretical conflicts covered earlier: on what basis may people create information that challenges dominant ideologies? This issue is not explicitly addressed in Foucault's "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" (1977, pp. 139-164) essay, which offers more concrete concepts for genealogy. On the contrary, the article seems to imply that genealogists who have previously worked as historians are more inclined to generate genealogical information. Obviously, one cannot claim that only intellectuals are capable of producing knowledge or that counter-hegemonic information in today's society cannot be created without intellectuals' specialised knowledge. However, the unease remains. Even today, people have different opinions on the scientific subject, particularly when it comes to the "neutrality" of commonly used techniques. To some extent, I agree with Foucault that procedures have other (political) uses and that norms are "empty" on their own. But it doesn't imply they don't have any power or unfairness on their own. Discussions on feminist techniques and approaches have persisted among feminists, and some have demonstrated that the main issue has been the current procedures in a particular science. The importance that Foucault places on "rules" suggests that a fight over them can spark a movement to alter those rules. Lastly, anti-essentialism seems to be a contentious topic. Without a doubt, Foucault argues that while genealogical knowledge is not "absolute," it is "tactical" and "effective," suggesting that it may be employed strategically to generate specific, counter-hegemonic power effects. It appears that this stance implies that genealogical knowledges are not always successful (counter-hegemonic), and that there are situations in which they might potentially be utilised to uphold a specific hegemony. In his criticism of conventional history and its impact on politics, Foucault is absolutely correct. Maybe we could also take a look at the anti-essentialist genealogy and how it has been used in the past and now, together with the contexts in which it was created and shared, the goals it served, and the political impacts it has had.

There appears to be a tendency in the current postmodern discussions about curriculum towards a theory that can create a curriculum that is epistemology-proof, meaning it can permanently ward off the problem(s) of knowledge. If this is the case, then it is problematic. In order to choose and arrange the knowledges to be taught, a specific theory of knowledge (like Foucault's genealogy or Connell's viewpoint theory) might serve as a guiding principle, as mentioned above. There will always be theoretical tensions in curriculum development, but using a specific epistemology as a theory won't solve them. This is because the methodological and

epistemological problems of knowing will crop up regardless of the theory used. That is to say, the knowledge problem(s) is not something that should or can be "proofed," but rather something that is inherent to the process of creating and implementing curricula and need ongoing theoretical investigation and discussion. The problems with knowledge in curriculum development necessitate a new metaphor. Whether one is engaged in theoretical investigation, subject matter study, or lesson preparation and delivery, the theoretical tensions inherent in each given curricular endeavour can be "ridden" (Simons, 1995, p. 3). A few things are true with the "riding tensions" metaphor. One reason is because the metaphor implies an action, which means that in order for curriculum development, teaching, and learning to take place, there must be a human agency. Another reason is that the metaphor shows how constant (almost habitual) movements, thoughts, and reassessments are necessary to preserve the tensions required for riding. Tightening the tensions too much can cause the project to collapse, while not tightening them enough could cause you to tumble off. Those of us who want to use our knowledge to promote liberty, equality, and social justice should also see the tensions for what they are. The metaphor encourages us to view education as "riding tensions" rather than "eliminating problems," and to acquire new competencies to help us remain engaged and alert throughout the process. Critical viewpoints should be exercised throughout the whole process of curriculum development and implementation with regard to the epistemological and methodological concerns of knowledge, specifically as they pertain to gender, class, and race.

Conclusion

Therefore, society is not static; values, traditions, customs, culture, etc., all undergo periodic changes. Some social critics have dubbed this era of history the information age, while others have placed it in the postmodern, later modern, high modern, or even uncertain era categories. The 'current age is an age of globalisation,' a phenomena that first appeared on the Indian economic landscape in the 1990s, might be included to this list. This buzzword has affected the educational system's place in the country's social, political, and economic fabric. A freeing, directing, and guiding force, philosophy of education equips youth and society at large to meet the problems of the contemporary day. The person gains a critical outlook on living in a varied culture and gains insight into the connection between his goals and ordinary labour.

References

1. Alam, Arshad. 2013. Controlling Minds, Discipling Bodies: Life inside a Madrasa. In Geetha Nambissan and Srinivas Rao. (ed.) Sociology of Education. Delhi, OUP.
2. Apple, M. (1982). Education and Power. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
3. Apple, M. (1987). Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education. Routledge.
4. Apple, M. W. (1979). Ideology and Curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
5. Aurobindo, S. (1950). The Human Cycle. New York: The Sri Aurobindo Library.
5. Apple, M. W. (1979). Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

6. Apple, M. W. (1985). Education and power. Boston: Ark Paperbacks.
7. Apple, M. W. (2000). Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
8. Apple, Michael. 1982. Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education. Essays on Class, ideology and the state. London, RKP. (Chapter 1 and 9).
9. Aurobindo, S. (1992). A New Education for a New Consciousness. Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Ashram.
10. Batra, Poonam. 2014. Probalematizing Teacher Education Practices in India. Developing a Research Agenda. Education As change. Vol. 18, No. S1: S5-S18
11. Bernstein, Basil. 1996. Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity, London, Tylor and Francis. (Chapter 1)
12. Bourdieu, Pierre. 2018. A Sketch for Self-Analysis. Cambridge, Polity Press
13. Bourdieu, P. (1974). The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities. In J. (. Eggleston, Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education (pp. 32-46). London: Methuen.
14. Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. In J. a. Karabel, Power and Ideology in Education. Oxford University Press.
15. Bourdieu, Pierre and J. C. Passeron. 1978. Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. London, Sage (Book 1).
16. Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The Forms of the Capital. In Richardson (ed.) Handbook of Research in the Sociology of Education, New York, Greenwood.
17. Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational reforms and the contradictions of economic life. New York: Basic Books.
18. Connell, R. W. (1993). School and social justice. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves.
19. Dewey, J. (1915). School and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
20. Dewey, John. 1916. Democracy and Education. New York, Free Press.
21. Durkheim, E. (1961). Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education. New York: The Free Press.
22. Durkheim, Emile. 1961. Moral Education. New York, The Free Press.
23. Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. (T. f. Sheridan, Trans.) New York: Vintage Books.
24. Foucault, M. (1977). Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews. (Donald Bouchard and Sherry Simon, Trans.; Donald Bouchard, Ed.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
25. Foucault, M. (1979). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. (Alan Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
26. Foucault, M. (1980). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977. (Colin Gordon, Ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
27. Foucault, M. (1988). Politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings, 1977–1984. (L. D. Kritzman, Ed.). New York: Routledge.
28. Foucault, M. (1991). The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom. In J.

- Bernauer & D. Rasmussen (Eds.), *The final Foucault* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge: The MIT Press.
29. Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Penguin Books.
 30. Friere, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New york, Continuum.
 31. Gandhi, M. (1953). *Towards new Education*. Ahmadabad: Navjivan Publishing House. Gandhi, M. (1953). *Towards New Education*. Ahmadabad: Navjivan Publishing House.
 32. Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart. Illich, I. (1984). *Deschooling Society*. Penguin Books.
 33. Gupta, Latika. 2015. *Formation of Religious Identity in Early Childhood*. In Thapan, Meenakshi. (ed.) *Education and Society. Themes, Perspectives, Practices*. Oxford University Press.
 34. Henry A Giroux (2011) *On critical pedagogy*, Continuum International Publishing Group, UK
 35. Illich Ivan (2013). *Deschooling Society* KKIEN Publ. Int.
 36. Jeffrey, Craig. 2010. *Timepass. Youth, Class and time in India*. CA, Stanford University Press.
 37. Krishna Kumar, 2002. *Prejudice and Pride*. New Delhi, Viking.
 38. Krishna kumar. 2004. *What is Worth Teaching?* Delhi, Orient Blackswan.
 39. Krishna Kumar. 2015. *Texts and Values*. In Thapan, Meenakshi. 2015 (ed.) *Education and Society. Themes, Perspectives, Practices*. Oxford University Press
 40. Krishnamurti, J. (n.d.). *Krishnamurti on Education*.
 41. Lois Weis, Cameron McCarthy, and Greg Dimitriadis (2006) *Ideology, Curriculum, and the New Sociology of Education*, Routledge.
 42. Manjrekar, Nandini. 2013. *Gender, Childhood, and Work in the Nation: Voices and Encounters in Indian School*. In Geetha Nambissan and Sriniva Rao. (ed.) *Sociology of Education*. Delhi, OUP
 43. Mannheim, K., & Stewart, W. (1962). *An Introduction to the Sociology of Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
 44. Muller, Thomas, Ulrike Lichtinger, Ralf Girg. 2015. *The MultiGrade MultiLevel-Methodology and its Global Significance* Immenhausen near Kassel / Germany. Prolog- Verlag.
 45. Nambissan, Geetha. 2003. *Social Exclusion, Children's Work and Education: A View from the margins*, in NailaKabeer, Geetha B. Nambissan and Ramya Subramaniam (eds.) *Child Labour and the Right to Education in South Asia*. Delhi, Sage: 109-141.
 46. Parsons, T. (1968). *The School class as a system: Some of its functions in American society*. In R. R. Bell, & R. H. Stub, *The Sociology of Education: A Sourcebook*. Homewood: The Dorsey Press.
 47. Peter McLaren (1995) *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture : Oppositional politics in apostmodern era.*, Routledge, London

48. Pinar, William F. 1975. The Method of "Currere". Address to the American Research Association. April 1975.
49. Pinar, William F. 2015. (ed.) Curriculum Studies in India. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
50. Simons, J. (1995). Foucault and the political. London and New York: Routledge.
51. Tagore, R. (1961). A Poet's School. In Rabindranath Tagore Pioneer in Education: Essays and Exchanges between Rabindranath Tagore and L.K. Elmhirst (pp. 44-65). London: Visva Bharati.
52. Tagore, R. (1961). The Art of Movement in Education. In Rabindranath Tagore Pioneer in Education: Essays and Exchanges between Rabindranath Tagore and L.K. Elmhirst (pp. 101-111). London: Visva Bharati.
53. Tagore, R. (1961). The Parrot's Training. In Rabindranath Tagore Pioneer in Education: Essays and Exchanges between Rabindranath Tagore and L.K. Elmhirst (pp. 96-100). London: Visva Bharti.
54. Thapan, M. (2006). The Life at School: An Ethnographic Study. Oxford University Press.
55. Thapan, M. (2014). School Experience: An Autobiographical Approach. In M. Thapan, Ethnographies of Schooling in Contemporary India (pp. 333-355). Sage.
56. Thapan, M. (2015). Introduction: Understanding Education - Ideas, Practice, and Outcomes. In M. (. Thapan, *Education and Society: Themes, Perspectives, Practices* (pp. 1-56). Oxford University Press.
57. Thapan, Meenakshi. 1991 (2006, 2nd edition). Life at School. An Ethnographic Study. Delhi, Oxford University Press.
58. Thapan, Meenakshi. 2014. (ed.) Ethnographies of Schooling in Contemporary India Sage.(1-7).
59. Thapan, Meenakshi. 2014. Chapter 8. School experience. An Autobiographical Approach. In M. Thapan(ed.) Ethnographies of Schooling in Contemporary India. Sage
60. Thapan, Meenakshi. 2015. (ed.) Education and Society. Themes, Perspectives, Practices. Oxford University Press. (Chapters 4 and 10)
61. Timothy Scrase, Image, Ideology and Equality. Cultural Domination, Hegemony and Schooling in India. New Delhi, Sage. Chapters 3-7.
62. Willis, Paul. 1977. Learning to labour. How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs Surrey, Saxon House.
63. www.ddceutkal.ac.in