CHAPTER 4

ENGAGING FREIRE’S PEDAGOGY FOR A CRITIQUE OF INDIAN EDUCATION

4.0. Introduction

The present chapter attempts to place Freire’s educational principles in a radically different cultural context of Indian educational scenario helps and draws out some of the cultural specificities in his theory to humanize both the oppressor and the oppressed.

4.1. Pedagogy as a Method of Application

Paulo Freire employs the term pedagogy in a non-traditional way. Pedagogy, for him is primarily a science of thinking and practice for social change. To him, teaching and instruction are tools for engendering revolution, not exclusively the means by which instructors encourage students to master certain school subjects but rather be the means of radically transforming the political outlook. Contemporary critical pedagogue is not defined as simply something that goes on in schools. On the contrary, it is posited as central to any political practice that takes up questions of how individuals learn, how knowledge is produced, and how subject-positions are constructed. In this context, pedagogical practice refers to forms of cultural production that are inextricably historical and political. Further, pedagogy is about the intellectual, emotional, and ethical investment to negotiate, accommodate, and transform the world. Pedagogy is not exclusively academic instead it is also socio-political, cultural and ethical. Therefore, Pedagogy is shaped by certain assumptions
about child, learning, teaching and the relationship between teaching and learning and schooling and society.

Pedagogy, basing on its role in knowledge transmission and in relation to society, can be of different kinds such as conservative pedagogy, conformist pedagogy, liberal pedagogy, radical pedagogy and critical pedagogy. It can be domestic or liberative. Most cultural pedagogies that purport to transmit cultural ethos could be domestic. Pedagogy that activates liberation of the poor is called liberative pedagogy. Accordingly there could be racist pedagogy, feminist pedagogy and marginalised pedagogy and so on. The liberative pedagogy by nature often is critical of the existing systems of knowledge and culture. Critical pedagogy tries to carve a space for students to question and challenge domination, and the beliefs and practices that dominate. In other words, it is a theory and practice of carving critical space for students to achieve critical consciousness whereby the teacher leads students to question ideologies and practices passed on in school/colleges.

According to Freire, liberation education focuses on the development of critical consciousness that enables learners to recognize connections between their individual problems and experiences and the social contexts in which they are embedded. Critical Pedagogy is the classical manifestation of Paulo Freire’s ideas whose work is concerned with the development of knowledge, autonomy, reflectivity, transformation, representation of reality. It confronts all forms of alienation, oppression and subordination.
4.2. Freire’s Principles of Pedagogy of Liberation Education

From the foregoing discussion we could identify the essential principles that constitute the pedagogy of liberation education with the view of applying them to analyse the Indian education system. In so doing the researcher aims at a critical understanding of the practice of Indian education so as to promote a dialogue between Educational Philosophy of Paulo Freire and Indian education purposive of social transformation.

With the spirit of enlightenment, Freire believed in education as a means to improve the human conditions, confronting the effects of psychology and sociology of oppression, contributing ultimately to what he considered the ontological vocation of the human race: Humanization. There are according to Freire two views on humankind. One view conceives of humans as objects: they are mouldable and adaptable. The other view sees humans as subjects, independent beings, able to transcend and recreate the world. In the first conception, humans can be compared with animals. They act and obey without taking time to reflect. An animal cannot see itself as ‘I’ against a ‘not I’, or in other words it cannot see itself separate from this world. If human beings are seen as objects, they are submerged in the world. They have not been given a chance of self-reflection. In the second view, human beings are seen as subjects. They can think and reflect for themselves and they can dissociate from the world. The essential difference between humans and animals is that humans can operate in the world through action and reflection.
Education among both the privileged and the oppressed maintains social stability and discourages change. It is accomplished by adopting an “attitude of adhesion” to the dictates of the ruling elite. It is not always apparent because the cold force of oppression is hidden under the guise of “solicitous paternalism” by the guardians of the status-quo. Oppressive sustaining mechanisms (including religious and political vehicles) obscure what they are actually doing by emphasizing their paternalistic concern or “mission” to assist the oppressed while all they are actually doing is allaying their own sense of guilt. Anyone who has worked in an educational context of privilege would have seen ample expressions of what Freire calls the “false messianism” of the educated elite whose actual, but unstated, intent is their own professional or personal interest.

A Freirean cannot humanize a person but can only acknowledge what is already true: our shared humanity. Those who are oppressed must gain, through “conquest,” their own freedom and dignity because it does not belong to anyone else to give to them. This has important ramifications for education among the privileged. The task of an educator in contexts of privilege is merely to “unveil the world of oppression” and expect that both the oppressed and the oppressor will begin to “believe” in their own intrinsic ability to become progressive “transformers of reality through creative labor.” As both the privileged and the oppressed gain greater conscientizacao, paternalistic charity in both directions is replaced by authentic, humane relational generosity.

Freire’s education, rooted in conscientizacao, expects that the relationship between the oppressed and the privileged will result, not only in social justice for the
oppressed, but also in the “liberation of the oppressor.” Unless this happens, it is predictive that those being educated in a privileged context will probably gain social power and find their predetermined role in the dehumanization of others and the distribution of resources. Such a role will dehumanize the privileged. Education, in any context, allows for understanding the world as it actually is, and an awareness of the actual social injustices of this world leave, in Freire’s mind, no alternative for the privileged but what he calls ‘class suicide’ where individuals willingly divest themselves of privilege (in essence, becoming traitors to their own self-interests). The privileged who genuinely are concerned about social justice will invariably repudiate “all that draws them toward middle-class standards and the natural attraction of that kind of class mentality, and to identify themselves with the working classes.”

Even when the privileged gain a small measure of awareness of what is actually happening in the world, the tendency, according to Freire, is for them to retreat ultimately to safer instincts of self protection that return their lives to those “marks of their origin: their prejudices and their deformations, which include a lack of confidence in the people’s inability to think, to want, to know.” Education that fosters oppression discourages analysis and inquiry without resolution.

Conversion of the privileged to solidarity with the oppressed is usually erased by objectification and paternalism. The privileged “believe that they (or their particular group) must be the executors of the transformation” simply because it is the nature of privilege to foster in people the assumptions that they should impose or force themselves and their solutions on those who are oppressed.” Using decidedly religious terminology, Freire calls for those seeking justice through education to
“incarnate justice, through communion with the people.” Another predominant motif in Freire’s work explains that “communion with the people must be more than mere theory; it must be integral to the life of the revolutionary.” Education is expressed not only by words but through actions and the visible, tangible decisions of lifestyles and identifications.

Dialogue will characterize solidarity with the oppressed. For Freire “the person who proclaims devotion to the cause of liberation who is unable to enter into communion with the people whom he or she continues to regard as totally ignorant is grievously self-deceived.” This kind of dialogue calls for action from within, as opposed to for, the oppressed. Instead of utilizing these models of self-denial, the privileged tend to take solace in objectifying a paternalistic “activism,” which Freire dismisses as “action for action’s sake.” Education among the privileged encourages their number to become quixotic “armchair-revolutionaries” who frequently engage in superficial and symbolic gestures in the guise of “opposing” social injustices. One recognizes this pattern in a reliance on “slogans, communiqués, monologues, and instructions” instead of a lifestyle of identification and solidarity with the oppressed. Education among the privileged, because it maintains that privilege, invariably is an exercise in self-promotion and will not result in any substantive social change. Paternalistic idealists look at problems from outside their own personal involvement. The privileged become part of the problem and allow for the mechanisms of injustice to continue unaffected by liberative education.

Education by the privileged to maintain the status-quo will be characterized by the abstraction of the “other” into generalized categories that underscore the
difference and the vulnerability of the oppressed. Education for the privileged often presents the oppressed as distant and “inanimate things” who are to be understood within the parameters of their oppression and not within the primary framework of their humanness.

Liberation education addresses both tendencies among the privileged by encouraging conscientizacao and self-denying solidarity. Freire is emphatic: “Any pedagogy which begins with the egoistic interests of the oppressors (often cloaked in the false generosity of paternalism) itself maintains and embodies oppression.” Oppressors, by definition, cannot initiate liberating education.

How does this relate to our task of education for social justice among the world’s privileged? A Freirean challenge for the privileged is to explain that we should not be complicitus in the preservation of the status-quo and to call for subjectivist immobility to be countered by seeing the “social ways” that oppression is promoted. Anesthetizing social welfare programs, according to Freire are expressions of “class robbery” because they have become “instruments of manipulation” that “ultimately serve the ends of conquest” because they “sedate and distract victims of injustice from” being aware of the “true causes of their problems.” While paternalistic social programs are presented as “realistic solutions,” they fail inevitably because they are not systemic and because they, in essence, assign blame to recipients, which leads to the oppressed embracing a “fatalism and despair” that fosters “a lack of vision.” The oppressed are taught to see themselves as social “outsiders,” while, in actuality, they are very much “inside the social structure which made them ‘beings for others.’” Both the privileged and
the oppressed often turn to religion for “magical explanations” of a God to whom they “fatalistically transfer the responsibility for their oppressed state.” If God is responsible for their plight, then nothing can be done to change their situation: “The oppressed see their suffering (the fruit of exploitation), as the will of God- as if God were the creator of this ‘organized disorder.’” Both religion and politics have been used in the education of the privileged to club dissenters into acquiescence.

Education can foster rebelliousness against the status-quo and frame such rebellion in moral and religious terms as an act of courageous love which is “committed to others.” Such oppression will not be challenged as long as education reduces students to vanquished “receptors” and “passive entities with their education making them even more passive still.” Asserting the “right to be human” breaks the power of the oppressor to control others, but it also restores to the privileged a sense of their own humanity which had been “lost in the exercise of oppression.” For Freire, revolution is not the goal but only a transitory phase delineating the boundary between injustice and greater justice. Education is a neutral force that can either sustain injustice or support positive social change. The narrative forms that education takes among either the privileged or the oppressed will determine whether it becomes a force to challenge individuals to question (rebel against) injustice or accept its inevitability. Educators among the privileged must particularly guard against talking about the world as if it were a “motionless, static, compartmentalized and predictable fact.” For Freireans there is an “eminently pedagogical character of the revolution” and that is why Freire entitled his book
The Pedagogy of the Oppressed rather than The Pedagogy for the Oppressed; both the oppressed and the privileged are responsible to struggle for their own liberation.

4.2.1. Humanization

For Paulo Freire, the vocation of each individual is to become more fully human, configured as emancipation from oppression. Liberation education works in the service of humanity's historical vocation to become more fully human by affirming and empowering students as "subjects of decision." Humanization is thwarted by the forces of dehumanization, which oppress human beings and limit their freedom. The oppressed must learn to liberate themselves, and in turn, their oppressors, who are also dehumanized through the very process of oppressing others. The Hindu ideal of humanization seeks to untie the distinction between the Self and the world, subject and object. In contrast, for Paulo Freire, the essence of humans lies in a separation between the self and the world. To be human is to experience that world as an objective reality, independent of oneself, capable of being known. Humans are able to escape from an animalistic state of being and step into the role of true subjects only when they are able to step back and objectify social reality, to understand the world as object in contrast to self as subject. This difference in worldviews in turn gets translated into differing views of the relationship between the human and natural worlds.

Indian culture considers the whole world as one family. This hierarchy leads Freire to conceive the role of human in terms of conquest and domination over the material world. The domination implicit in dialogue is that of the world by the
dialoguers; it is conquest of the world for the liberation of humankind. His insistence is that education must serve the goal of humanization. His argument is that in a situation of dehumanizing oppression, the process of humanization must begin through a humanizing pedagogy that empowers the oppressed to lead their struggle against oppression. Liberation, a human phenomenon, cannot be achieved by semi-humans. Any attempt to treat people as semi-humans only dehumanizes them. Freire sees trust and faith in the people’s capacity to make and remake, to create and re-create, as fundamental to a humanizing pedagogy that involves true dialogue and communion with the oppressed. Efforts at reinventing pedagogy of the oppressed in an Indian context will have to attempt to reconcile the differences between Freirean and Indian notions of humanization. The challenge is to find ways to frame the ideals of critical pedagogy in terms of Indian notions of what it means to be human; in ways that acknowledge the importance of material and political development while emphasizing community-oriented, ecological, and spiritual values of Freirean views of humanization as engaging in praxis which transforms the world, and Indian notions of humanization as cultivating the inner spiritual world through devotion, social duty and sacrifice, could potentially be reconciled in ways that acknowledge both views.

Moreover, the contrast between Freire’s view of humans as distinct from their environment and Hindu views of humans as merging with the natural world can also offer a critique of the anthropocentric nature of Freire’s thought. However what this conflict suggests is not that Pedagogy of the oppressed is inapplicable in the
Indian context, but rather that it must find different metaphors and world images framing its ideals in terms of Indian notions of what it means to be human. Moreover, the contrast between Freire’s view of humans as distinct from their environment and Hindu views of humans as merging with the natural world can also offer a critique of the anthropocentric nature of Freire’s thought. What the comparison with Hindu notions of humanization can add to this critique is the suggestion that perhaps the ecological tensions in Freire’s writing stems from the fundamental metaphor that Freire uses to conceptualize the nature of human beings. Critical pedagogy is susceptible to a worldview that justifies human domination over the natural world and human development at the expense of the environment. The cultural specificities that have been brought out in Freire’s view of humanization, in the light of the fundamentally different orientation of the Hindu view, serve to highlight the subsequent tensions that would emerge when critical pedagogy is applied to an Indian setting.

**Inference:** Education is to create human and to be humanized. If

### 4.2.2. Education that liberates

Good many of the Indian educationists of the post-independence period have accepted the traditional Indian dictum, that the ultimate end of learning *vidya* is the liberation of man through acquisition of knowledge development of awareness. Malcolm S. Adiseshiah in his working document "Functionality of literacy" presented at the *Persepolis Conference*, advocated: a wider package of literacy and education which promotes the need of the poor person to organize himself/herself and his/her
fellow sufferers and fight against the existing power centres, the irrelevant decision making processes, against the growing poverty he/she is living in and for equitable and just social and political order. In the Persepolis Declaration, to which all UNESCO members including India are signatories, it was resolved that literacy should contribute to the liberation of man and his full development as suggested by Freire.

Anil Bordia is of the view that, the function of adult education for a rural society is to be with the people to enable them to recharge their creative capabilities and to critically understand the ways in which the rural institutions and relationships can obstruct development. Anil Bordia's vision of adult education still remains an unrealized vision. Not even adult education has helped to bridge the chasm between centres of higher education and the common people. Literacy, and even general education, has led to the domestication of people rather than their liberation. These have not (except in very few cases) prompted them to question the unjust and exploitative structures of the society. It is evident from the above discussion that interaction between educational institutions and community is an intrinsic aspect of India's vision of education, and that Freire have a special relevance in the formulation of the interaction process.

In Pedagogy of the oppressed, Paulo Freire states that traditionally education is framed as an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher, is the depositor. The task of the teacher, in traditional education, Freire says, is to fill the students with the content of his narration-content which is detached from reality, disconnected from the totality that engendered them and could give them significance. This type of education, he believes, is suffering from narration sickness.
He suggests that in such schools the task of the student is to receive, memorize, and repeat. This, he believes, turns them into receptacles to be filled by the teacher. In such an environment, teachers are active while students are passive members of the classroom community. Freire argues that the interests of the two are different in such relationship; teachers promote the goal of the oppressors by depositing information into the students: the oppressed. A Freire claim that education based on this model—which he calls the banking concept—annuls “the students’ creative power” and serves the interests of the oppressors. Freire further asserts that education as the exercise of the domination stimulates the credulity of students, with the ideological intent (often not perceived by educators) of indoctrinating them to adapt to the world of oppression.

He explains that the banking concept assumes a person [to be] merely in the world, not with the world or with others; the individual is a spectator, not re-creator. He suggests that the banking concept does not see a person as a conscious being—which he calls *corpo consciente*; for the banking concept a person is rather the possessor of a consciousness: an empty ‘mind’ passively open to the reception of deposits of reality from the world outside.

Education based on problem-posing ensures active teachers and active students within the classroom and the global community. The interests of both the teachers and the students, then, within the problem-posing classroom, become the same. In fact, Freire maintains that problem-posing education aims at the emancipation of those who have been subjected to domination. Freire claims that to that end, [problem-posing education] enables teachers and students to become Subjects of the education process by overcoming authoritarianism and an alienating intellectualism; it also enables
people to overcome their false perception of reality. This overcoming of the false perception of reality is, I believe, the true measurement of growth. It is thus obvious that, as Freire suggests, the banking concept entails intellectual alienation and prevents growth.

Freire argues that this education—for freedom from alienation—is impossible without dialogical relations between the student and the teacher. It is only dialogue that ensures student-teacher relationship in which “the teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. The individuals who have been oppressed, he suggests, only through dialogue can unlearn what society has so far taught them. This translates into transforming or changing our realities, or making or remaking of our history, or attaining humanization. Dialogue also promotes critical thinking because it is only through questioning the problems in our lives that we can take steps to remake them. Therefore, to be an active participant in the community one needs to be in constant dialogue with the state and within the state, i.e., with the other members of the state. It is through dialogue that we can attain conscientização or critical consciousness. Conscientização does not only include apprehending the inequalities in one’s life but also taking action in order to change them. Conscientização, then, entails both consciousness and praxis—taking practical action to deal with (oppressive) realities in life. Freire suggests that only when dialogue succeeds, these adults [can] begin to change society. Therefore, Freire believes that the problem-posing method along with
*conscientização* and *praxis* lead to education as the practice of freedom or in other words that education liberates.

### 4.2.3. *Conscientizacao - a Force*

All educational structures and theories, according to Freire, begin within specific political frameworks. These political presuppositions are never objective. The educator functions as politician, artist, and advocate and should not be viewed as a “cold, neutral technician”; He rises above political realities related to injustice, wealth, and privilege. Education is, in fact, often the very ‘essence of oppression’ supported by the powerful who, with insistent assertion, “desire conquest” over those whom they oppress. The oppressor focuses on “changing the consciousness of the oppressed and not the situation which oppresses them” by inculcating worldview assumptions that portray injustice as an inevitable. The oppressed are given, by the oppressors’ education, a rationale for their own domination. The oppressed are educated into accepting their vanquished status as being inevitable perhaps even desirable. In this way, the oppressor goes unchallenged, while the oppressed embraces an “oppression-hosting conscience” where the worldview of the oppressor become “housed within” the victim’s own way of understanding the world. Education, in both content and delivery, becomes a weapon whereby the subjugated learn to adapt to the world of their oppressor. Curriculum, faculty hires, financial aid, and questions about the allocation of funds will be dramatically different when such an educational function and structure is embraced. The sum of these conclusions is what Freire calls *conscientizacao.*
The concept, conscientization speaks of the way that an individual, through education, comes to learn of the social, economic and political contradictions of the world and to address those elements with either passive acceptance or active resistance. Freire saw it as a social and collective process. The oppressed, because they feel that they have been “dismissed from life” come to regard education as something that is threatening at worst, or at best, as a meaningless exercise in futility. This analysis finds a possible solution in Freire’s notion of the development of conscientization among students of privilege who would progressively shift in their perspective from the naïve to the critical, from a posture of privilege and entitlement to the confidence and awareness of an agent within society who is able to work for social justice.

To combat the blossoming of conscientizacao, Freire writes, the oppressor maintains the status-quo through education by keeping the vanquished from realizing that they are being victimized. The oppressed need, in a moment of epiphany, to recognize what actually is happening to them in order to gain an authentic view of the world. Instead, many of the poor remain resigned to the lobotomized “security of conformity” where the oppressed are afforded, at least, some “guaranteed space” where they know their place and are able to make sense of their world. The same process applies to those born and educated in wealth and privilege. The educational system for the oppressed has no self-defeating mechanism to foster within the privileged any notion that they enjoy the benefit of their lives by impoverishing and oppressing others. Education for the privileged is not interested in promoting an awareness of the ‘invasive nature’ of social injustice.
The privileged, in fact, are encouraged to see themselves in a positive light as those who are deeply concerned about the plight of those they are actually responsible (directly or indirectly) for tyrannizing. The privileged protect their status as superior while also paternalistically thinking of themselves, to use Kipling’s idea (not in reference to ethnicity but status), as the ‘great white hope’ of benighted, oppressed people who are in need of their assistance (be it the gift of their religion or their politics but not usually their direct economic sacrifice).

A lack of **conscientizacao** in the oppressed and the privileged on their context as well as their own potential fosters in both the myth of the ‘oppressor ideology’ where ignorance is absolutized and enforced on both protagonists. The privileged accept their role as professionals who can help by educating/transmitting their religious or political solutions (learned, importantly, in contexts that accept oppression as a *fait accompli*) on those who do not fit into the way they see that the world should function. Education for both the privileged and the oppressed defines an educated person as one who is an “adapted person because he or she is a better fit for the world.”

Education as indoctrination for both the privileged and the oppressed promotes an imposed tranquility with everything understood and defined by those who are in the know and whose authority to know and command cannot come into question. This analysis explains why educators, in any social context, encourage students to think instead of understand an externally imposed evaluation and in terms of methodology advocate questions.
Conscientizacao is stunted by a host of factors. While Freire speaks of the oppressed as being “manipulated by a series of myths” which are upheld by a “series of deceits and promises,” the same can be said for the privileged in educational structures that fundamentally exist to promote the (unjust) status-quo. Whether it is political or religious, sectarianism looks at the world with “naïve and magical perception” which explains the other while releasing the self from any relation to the other’s plight.

Conscientization is often eroded by cultural invasion. It meant that those who rule civic society with economic control also seeks to rule spiritually. Education among the privileged must give attention to the ways that the embrace or promotion of globalized cultural iconography leads to cultural invasion. Educational structures themselves also invade cultures because they are framed as paternalistic responses to those who are oppressed. Freire writes that “education often is used by cultural invaders to penetrate cultures out of disrespect to cultural potentialities.” Cultural invasion attacks the oppressed because the privileged accept the intrinsic inferiority of the oppressed, and the oppressed feel that they need to ‘adhere’ to the cultural values of those who are invading their culture. The educational structures of the privileged are to ensure that this cycle continues. Freire writes “Whether they are in nurseries or universities” oppressors are prepared “to become the invaders of the future.” This cycle will be interrupted by educational models that promote cultural synthesis instead of cultural invasion.

In Freire’s alternative model the privileged do not relate to the oppressed with distancing paternalism and without trying to “teach or to transmit or to give anything
but rather to learn with the people." \textsuperscript{cccxl} Education for the privileged that promotes social justice will not objectify the oppressed. The privileged will come to understand, according to Freire, that either indirectly or directly they are either the spectators or directors in the present-day realities of social injustice. One of the main reasons that the education of the privileged continues to facilitate paternalism is because it usually fosters in students “a strongly possessive consciousness." \textsuperscript{cccxlvi} Instead of fostering within the privileged a continued sense of themselves as mere consumers with purchasing power, Freirean values encourage educators to develop within the privileged a sense of their own human identification with the oppressed. Freire states that those in power “\textit{have} instead of \textit{are}. For them having more is an inalienable right, a right they acquire through their own effort." \textsuperscript{cccxlvii} The commoditization of education among the privileged typifies one important way that education in that context supports the maintenance of an unjust social status-quo. \textsuperscript{cccxlviii}

Educators of the privileged can proactively encourage \textit{conscientizacao} by generating an attitude of awareness through critical reflection, a pre-requisite for liberative education. The privileged will gradually “emerge from their submersion and acquire the ability to intervene in reality as it is unveiled” \textsuperscript{cccxlvi} instead of seeing the world from their ideals and expectations. Through \textit{conscientizacao}, both the privileged and the oppressed become “masters of their (own) thinking” \textsuperscript{cccel} and are able to live with each other in mutual respect and authentic dialogue.

\textbf{4.2.4. Tools for Liberation}

Aristotle conceived the object of education as the disinterested endeavour to learn and propagate that which is best known and thought. However, with the passage
of centuries, the rationale of education has undergone a sea-change. In the context of globalization and commercialization of almost every walk of life, the main concern today is how to increase production and how to make more money. Education inevitably has been made to subserve these interests. Today most students decide about their course of study not on the basis of the intrinsic worth of the subject, or his/her aptitude for it, but on the basis of the money it can fetch, once the course is successfully completed. It is no more a disinterested endeavour.

In India the authentic concept of education has always been liberative (Sa Vidya Ya Vimukthaye). Liberation, a holistic concept in the Indian context, is not only socio-economic but also spiritual. As a result of education, the educated person ought to feel liberated on many fronts: liberated from whatever curtails his imagination, liberated in thought processes, liberated on social as well as economic fronts. But, unfortunately, owing to historical factors we have been forced to adopt an urban, elite-oriented tertiary education system which has now perpetuated itself through the vested interests of those who sponsor it. Individuals benefit by the system, at the cost of the community. Through IITs, medical colleges and other centres of advanced studies the elite find their way to the United States, or to some other developed country, adding to the adverse power polarization in the world. Teachers feel comfortable in their academic isolation away from society. University does not have an effective system by which the entire society can be awakened and made resurgent. This is an oppressive state of affairs in the ultimate analysis.

Freire taught that ‘education in the service of liberation’ could dislodge students from intellectual stasis and rigid conformity to the status-quo. Education
had the potential to empower students to respond thoughtfully to the social controls that sustain and undergird oppression. Freire thought that education and not religious structures would provide the best pathway to empower those who were down-trodden. This was because that education had the potential to become a subversive force. For Freire, subservience must be countered by subversion. He argued that the oppressed live in subservience to the privileged in fatalistic silence. The poor remain perpetually under-educated and trapped beneath imposed layers of pervasive ignorance and lethargy. This dominated status is supported by a selected education that the oppressor provides for them intentionally designed to strengthen a superimposed system of economic, social, and political domination.

Critical consciousness does not come naturally as a by-product of economic change but grows out of critical education. So, the students must come to the realization that they are the maker of culture and transformer of the world through gaining and experimenting with knowledge. The student is a subject in the world and with the world, no longer just an object or a participant in the culture of silence. New levels of awareness can be reached, wherein the learner is no longer an object of others’ will, but a self-determining subject. The ultimate goal of critical education is the creation of a democratic society. The critical education is the process by which institutions of higher education enter into a healthy and productive relationship with locals in their vicinity. The educated persons should get down to the poor to facilitate relationships, leading to the development of people's critical consciousness as well as social capital. This implies a value orientation in which poverty is not to be seen as deficit, but as broken relationships. This is basically a Freirean approach which can
lead to the rejuvenation of the educational system and the long delayed national resurgence.

4.2.5. Education for the Liberation of the oppressed

The Indian worldview places a greater emphasis on liberation as an inner rather than outer event, dependent on a spiritual shift in consciousness rather than on the attainment of certain political or material conditions. Social, political and economic institutions and disorder are seen as reflections of or defences against the turbulence of the inner world. Societal oppression can only be addressed by first addressing internal oppression at the level of the individual. Freire, on the other hand, understands oppression primarily in terms of societal structures and the material struggle between oppressor and oppressed classes. This understanding of oppression as external in turn informs Freire’s views on liberation, which consists in the resolution of contradictions between oppressor and oppressed classes, and the permanent transformation of social structures, achieved through praxis in the material world rather than in the inner world. Rather, liberation takes place in the transformative action of human beings on the world, under specific historical and social circumstances.

Paulo Freire’s pedagogy is marked by an explicit commitment to the liberation of oppressed populations, linking pedagogy to politics and the struggle against oppressive social conditions. Teacher-centred pedagogic styles were a feature of ancient Brahminic education which was traditionally used to consolidate Brahmin hegemony over Hindu society. There is a sanction of the caste system in the ideology
of knowledge itself. And the caste system legitimized the hegemony of Brahmins in Hindu society. Recently there has been an awakening in Hindu society regarding caste system oppression that has lasted for more than three thousand years. People defy this age-old code of Manu that sustains such oppression. However, Brahmins are working to reinstate their position in society by means of ‘Hindutva’. This concept still misleads common people. On the surface, this idea aims at geographical, racial, religious, cultural and linguistic unity among Hindus. On the deeper level, however, Hindutva seeks to promote again a hierarchical, Brahmin-dominated Hindu Society. The oppressed class is submerged, having accepted the thing status into which they are oppressed. The historical vocation of the oppressed class is to struggle against the oppressor and realize their humanity which the oppressor denies them. The oppressor class subjugates the oppressed by ensuring their ignorance can be aptly applied to the ownership of knowledge claimed by the Brahmin caste in India. Freirean analysis provides a starting point from which to challenge oppressive features of Indian pedagogy, and to develop an alternative pedagogy geared towards liberation.

Implementing Paulo Freire pedagogy in India can combine Freire’s commitment to a pedagogy of liberation with a broader notion of what is meant by liberation. Gandhi’s model integrates on internal liberation with social action for political liberation. For him, reformation of society is inextricably linked with self-transformation or self-rule (swaraj). But Freire differs from the idea of liberation of Gandhi that a Freirean cannot humanize a person (and in so doing, objectify) but
can only acknowledge what is already true: our shared humanity. Those who are oppressed must gain, through “conquest,” their own freedom and dignity because it does not belong to anyone else to give to them. This has important ramifications for education among the privileged.

The task of a Freirean educator in the contexts of the privileged is merely to unveil the world of oppression and expect that both the oppressed and the oppressor will begin to believe in their own intrinsic ability to become progressive “transformers of reality through creative labor.” As both the privileged and the oppressed gain greater conscientizacão, paternalistic charity in both directions is replaced by authentic, humane relational generosity. The relationship between the oppressed and the privileged will result, not only in social justice for the oppressed, but also in the “liberation of the oppressor.” Unless this happens, it is predictable that those being educated in a privileged context will probably gain social power and find their predetermined role in the dehumanization of others and the distribution of resources. Such a role will dehumanize the privileged, and this is why it becomes increasingly more difficult for them to gain liberation from their entangling social role except as they seek to divest themselves of those privileges and benefits.

4.2.6. Non-Paternalistic Pedagogy

A major theme in Freire’s work as it relates to education among the privileged is how education can lift the oppressed from dehumanizing marginalization, “a living death,” to affirmation and self-respect that empowers the oppressed to “transcend” social limitations. Education for the privileged should foster an
appreciation for the intrinsic human worth of all who are oppressed and explore ways that suffering can be alleviated from a posture of solidarity instead of paternalism. While Freire observes that the oppressors often minimize or disregard the victimization of the oppressed in order to advance their own self-interests, educators for social justice, aware of this tendency, can encourage students of privilege to hear the voices of the oppressed even when articulated in rage and violence.

Paternalism, according to Freire, creates an emotional bond of control and dependence between the oppressed and their oppressors. Religions, political and educational structures offer paternalistic solutions that raise the oppressor’s self-esteem while, at the same time, forcing the oppressed into even greater dependence on their so-called assistance. Education given by paternalists will lead to the oppressed being apathetic or indifferent, according to Freire, because what is being taught (or not being taught) is basically irrelevant to the lives of the oppressed. Those who are being oppressed come to internalize “the opinion that the oppressors hold of them” while privileged students observe at a safe distance (Freire mirthfully calls the oppressor in this role, the Professor, the miserable plight of others with sympathetic paternalism. Education as indoctrination for both the privileged and the oppressed promotes an imposed tranquillity with everything understood and defined by those who are in the know and whose authority to know and command cannot come into question. Frequently, adaptation to diversity ends up reducing schools in low-income areas to limited perspectives of pedagogy of care that, in the name of giving love to minority students, do not challenge them but rather transform teaching into parental coddling. Freire states, however, that “it is not possible to be a teacher
without losing one’s students, even realizing that love is not enough, but it is not possible to be a teacher without loving teaching. Minorities students from poor school districts have the same capacity to learn as the students of elite schools; they only need to know so, and to have the opportunity to demonstrate it by being offered the same quality of education. In some places, teachers’ paternalism has contributed to the reproduction and promotion of social inequalities, a fact that some scholars have associated with social Darwinism: instruction for the elite and care for the lower class. Freire dedicated his life and work to a struggle for social and educational equality that rejects such forms of paternalism.

4.2.7. Non-Conformist Pedagogy

The pedagogical principles and practices, which are in operation in classrooms and which aim at maintaining status quo are essentially conformist in nature. The so-called behaviourist pedagogy that is dominating classroom practices views the educational process as a transmitting process. And any transmitting process necessarily emphasizes wittingly or unwittingly the preservation and perpetuation of the existing order. Hence, present pedagogy is, primarily, conformist in nature. It works for the submergence of consciousness of students. Classroom practices of conformist pedagogy deliberately work for the construction in terms of culture of silence. Pedagogy of the oppressed, in opposition to conformist pedagogy, works for the development of critical consciousness of learners.

The concept of democratic education where students participate in their own curriculum development is brought further by Freire’s concept of the student as an
empty vessel: "They call themselves ignorant and say the professor is the one who has knowledge and to whom they should listen. Almost never do conformists realize that they, too, know things they have learned in their relations with the world and with other men and women."  

Paulo Freire uses class analysis on the Marx’s concept of subjective to indicate that only a minority benefits from the status quo. The ruling class or elite definitely benefits from the masses being silent, without a voice of opposition. This culture of silence is a political reality. Domination is based on religious, political, and economical influence of the elite minority, which has enslaved the marginalized for centuries. Therefore Paulo Freire’s liberative pedagogy considers the student to be an active learner. The teacher is just as much a participant of learning as is the student, who also takes part in the teaching. Furthermore, each student has a history, culture and language. All this accumulates into knowledge.

4.2.8. Not Authoritarianistic Pedagogy

The role of the teacher according to Paulo Freire is as being a ‘partner’ breaking the traditional ‘vertical patterns’ characteristic of banking education. Freire says that the teacher will be taught by the students and on traditional education as “exercise in domination”, and referring to teachers as “bank clerk teachers” who are “prescribers” and “domesticators”. He is of the opinion that authoritarian teachers believe they know everything and students know nothing; do
all the talking while students meekly listen, think and act on behalf of students; enforce their discipline and choices on the compliant students; set up their authority in opposition to the freedom of the students. Freire acknowledges the need for directivity in educational practice, but it is when this directivity interferes with the creative, investigative capacity of students, that it becomes manipulative and authoritarian. He argues that this authoritarian stance converts students into mere objects, eliciting either rebellious defiance by students, or their apathy, excessive obedience, uncritical conformity, lack of resistance against authoritarian discourse, self-abnegation, and fear of freedom. Learning has to be changed by reciprocal and dialogical, favours to understand and respect the cultural diversity of all students, and develops relationship of caring, sharing and nurturing each other.

The *chhandogya Upanishad* speaks of the student as residing with family of *acharya* in the neighbourhood of guru’s family, the term ‘*antevasin*’ was used for the student. The purpose of Vedic education which is discriminatory, propagated by *Gurukula* system where the students live with the Guru’s residence, leading a celibate life and obtained education till the period gets over. Paternalism like this, according to Freire, creates an emotional bond of control and dependence between the oppressed and their oppressors. Education among both the privileged and the oppressed often maintains social stability and discourages change. This maintenance is most easily accomplished by both the privileged and the oppressed adopting an “attitude of adhesion” to the dictates of the ruling elite. This is not always apparent because the cold force of oppression is often hidden under the
guise of “solicitous paternalism”\(^{ccclxxix}\) by the guardians of the status-quo. Oppressive sustaining mechanisms (including religious and political vehicles) obscure what they are actually doing by emphasizing their paternalistic concern or ‘mission’ to assist the oppressed while all they are actually doing is allaying their own sense of guilt.\(^{ccclxxx}\) Socio-politico-economic-education offers paternalistic solutions to raise the oppressor’s self-esteem while, at the same time, forcing the oppressed into even greater dependence on their so-called assistance. Education given by either despots or paternalists will lead to the oppressed being apathetic or indifferent, according to Freire, because what is being taught (or not being taught) is basically irrelevant to the lives of the oppressed.\(^{ccclxxi}\) Those who are being oppressed come to internalize “the opinion that the oppressors hold of them”\(^{ccclxxii}\) while privileged students observe at a safe distance (Freire mirthfully calls the oppressor in this role, the Professor’) the miserable plight of others with sympathetic paternalism. Education as indoctrination for both the privileged and oppressed promotes an imposed tranquillity with everything understood and defined by those who are in the know and whose authority to know and command cannot come into question.\(^{ccclxxiii}\)

Indian Education system has only one entry at the completion of age five. It is structured into Elementary and Middle, Secondary and higher secondary where time and space are highly stipulated. There cannot be any other entry once the age is gone. The syllabus and curriculum is rigid and fixed for all the standards. Therefore the pedagogical principles and practices that are in operation in classroom aimed at maintaining status quo, hence, it is essentially conformist in nature. The behaviourist
pedagogy that is dominating classroom practices believes in the educational process as a transmitting process and it, necessarily, emphasizes, wittingly or unwittingly on the preservation and perpetuation of the existing order. Pedagogy, conformist in nature, works for the submergence of consciousness of students. Hence, the classroom practices of conformist pedagogy deliberately work for the construction of what Paulo Freire calls the ‘culture of silence’. It is a political reality whereby the ruling class or elite definitely benefits from the masses being silent, without a voice of opposition reflects the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. Freire pedagogy of the oppressed stress that the individual learns to cultivate his own growth through situations from his daily life that provide useful learning experiences. This is not pedagogy for the oppressed; it is rather pedagogy of the oppressed. The subject should build his reality from the circumstances that give rise to the daily events of his life. The texts that the individual creates permit him to reflect upon and analyze the world in which he lives - not in an effort to adapt himself to this world, but rather as part of an effort to reform it and to make it conform to his historical demands. There is no set curriculum, because the dialogue depends on the interests and needs of the group and will vary from group to group and region to region. Furthermore, each student has a history, culture, and language is accumulating into knowledge.

In ancient India, the system of studentship began with an initiation ceremony called *Upanayana* by his chosen teacher called *Acharya*, through which a student enters upon the stage of studentship. His second birth is spiritual where it unfolds
his mind and soul “the teacher recreates the pupil in a new body of learning”. By entering into a new life he had to undergo a twofold course of discipline, physical and spiritual. The student has to sit at the foot of teachers for learning. It is a one-way traffic and not reciprocal. According to Freire, do all the talking while students meekly listen, think and act on behalf of students; enforce their discipline and choices on the compliant students; set up their authority in opposition to the freedom of the students. Through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers.

Education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers and students. Freire seeks to resolve the teacher-student contradiction, to exchange the role of depositor, prescriber, domesticator, for the role of student among students. He rejects a model where the teacher knows more and has the prescribed role of teaching the student whose role it is to learn. This horizontal teacher-student relationship may not be appropriate in Indian classrooms which are characterized by a deep respect for the authority of the teacher, which is seen as legitimate and justified. All the representations of the teacher-taught relationship oblige the child to accept the moral and epistemic superiority of the teacher and therefore to concede his authority. The power relationship in which teacher and students are positioned, and their appropriate roles in relation to each other on the acceptance of the teacher’s authority, are
actively embraced as part of the identity assigned to each role. In this context, the teacher’s authority is not regarded as negative, and a horizontal teacher-student relationship may not be seen as desirable.

Freire’s ideal of shared power between teachers and students also translates into a non-directive stance on the part of teachers, where students are able to direct their own learning. Freire describes an instance where his students asked him to speak first, since as the teacher he knew more; and Freire argues against this, rejecting the notion that the teacher knows more than the student, and urging the students to speak instead of what he already knew. The conflict between Freirean and Indian notions of the ideal power relationship between teachers and students suggests that critical pedagogy could benefit from a deeper engagement with the concepts of power and authority, as well as from a deeper analysis of the ways in which students or oppressed groups are also already exercising power. Freire’s understanding of power derives largely from European Marxist traditions, whereby power is seen primarily in terms of control over material resources and means of production. What matters is how power is used.

Freire stresses intersubjectivity, or intercommunication as the "primordial characteristic of this cultural and historical world." The act of knowing requires a relation of communication between subjects with reference to a knowable object, rather than a simple relation between a subject and knowable object. Further, he explains that knowledge must be mediated between subjects, rather than one subject depositing his/her thinking into another. Freire warns of two erroneous ways
that can produce false views of education. Education should be towards a constant process of liberation. Growth is a constant lifetime process for all participants in discussion. Interdisciplinary education as Klen defines is “a process of answering a question, solving a problem, or addressing a topic that is too broad or complex to be dealt with by a single discipline or profession.” Its curriculum aims to incorporate a variety of skill-based activities taking the students on a journey, which will eventually lead them to initiate a self-reflective course of action.

4.2.9. Beyond Hegemony

Hegemony is a control by consent, ideological leadership, consensual control, dominant group in society, including fundamentally, but exclusively the ruling class, maintain their dominance by seeing the spontaneous consent of subordinate groups, including classes, through the negotiated conservation of a political and ideological consensus which incorporate both dominant and dominated groups. Brahmanical education system became more rigid about the caste and women education even among the superior castes, higher learning came to be restricted to Brahmins. Both teachers and students were Brahmins and enjoyed a high social status. Brahmanism is an ideological and institutional system of monopolizing knowledge and power by a particular class which uses these to exclude, divide and dominate other groups in society. There is a close relationship between knowledge and power, and saw education as a key tool used by Brahmins to perpetuate their hegemony. By denying knowledge to the shudras, the Brahmins might be held responsible for the condition of masses and for the backwardness of Hindu society itself. Dominant groups in
India have used education as a tool of oppression withholding access not only to education in general, but also access to critical literacy in particular within education.

The intentional suppression of critical moments in Indian tradition by powerful groups is as a form of pedagogical violence against subaltern classes. Rather than stating that the Indian masses are completely devoid of critical ability. This competence has been intentionally suppressed, through two different mechanisms operating in different historical situations. Under conditions of social crisis, this surfaces as a forceful reaction to actual or nascent popular critical activity. This educational project thrives on denying agency to the people, by controlling competence or the capability of people to critically interpret messages, based on experienced contradictions between ideological claims and the practiced reality, and of thus transforming information into knowledge by making it come true through social action aimed at liberation from want and oppression. The denial of critical ability to the Indian masses has played an important role in their subjugation by the elite. The chief evil in Brahmanical domination is the promotion among the masses of blind faith in religious texts and authorities as divinely imposed. Education as it is currently practiced in India is serving to perpetuate the suppression of this critical literacy and the maintenance of oppressive structures in Indian society. It is Paulo Freire’s concept of conquest aids as the oppressor imposes his objective on the vanquished, reduce people to things, even culturally they are vanquished. Mystification is the process by which the alienating and oppressive features of culture are disguised and hidden. False, superficial, and naive interpretations of
culture prevent the emergence of critical consciousness. Educational systems are key instruments in the dissemination of mystifications: e.g. unemployment is mystified as personal failure rather than as a failure of the economy, thus making it difficult for the unemployed to critically understand their situation. In order to destroy in people their abilities to think or to react, the oppressors mythicise the world, e.g., all are equal. Through hard work anyone can come up, rich people are ready to lend money and help etc. These myths are put out in the form of propagandas, they control the media.

4.2.10. Non-Authoritarian Teacher

In opposition to banking education, Freire proposes problem-posing education assuming that teachers are actually teachers and students (teacher-student) and that student are students and teachers (student-teacher). “Education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teacher and students.” Both learn from and teach each other. Every person learns a lot through experiences, formal and informal education, which s/he can share. It is these experiences which, when related to new information, allow a person to learn more and quickly. It makes the knowledge learned in a classroom relevant.

Problem-posing education does not diminish the teacher’s importance or the respect for the hard work and effort exerted in becoming formally educated. Rather, it seeks to raise the consciousness of the importance of the student and to establish respect for their role within the setting. To some extent, the teacher must steer the direction of the course, but the students must have ownership in the curriculum “while
requiring the effective presence of the teacher – his or her orientation, stimulus, authority – that discipline must be built and adopted by the students.” The students’ active participation in the class, and its structure and content will ensure the students’ interest, increase everyone’s learning, and will encourage a participatory, inclusive structure of a liberated society. Both students and teachers will have a new experience which can be implemented on a bigger scale, in their communities, societies, and governments. This acknowledgement of mutual dependency and value helps to break down hierarchy and class, and destroy a stratified scale of human-worth, based on formal education, wealth, gender and race.

The dialogical pedagogical praxis according to Paulo Freire constituted an act of love. Dialogue cannot exist in the absence of a profound love for the world and for human beings. Because love is an act of courage, not of fear, love is commitment to others. No matter where the oppressed are found, the act of love is commitment to their cause of liberation. And this commitment, because it is a loving one, is dialogical. Only by abolishing the situation of oppression is it possible to restore the love which that situation made impossible. If I do not love the world—if I do not love life—if I do not love human beings— I cannot enter into dialogue. Thus, problem-posing education relies on a transformed and transformational, respectful relationship between the teacher and the student. Problem-posing education, in Freire’s words, which seemed to equate teachers and students, generated a staggering amount of debate over the teacher’s role. However, in a dialogue Freire sought to clarify his view of the teacher as directive and authoritative, but not authoritarian: “I have never said that the educator is the same as the pupil. The educator is different
from the pupil. But this difference, from the point of view of the revolution, must not be antagonistic. The difference becomes antagonistic when the authority of the educator, different from the freedom of the pupil, is transformed into authoritarianism. For me, it is absolutely contradictory when the educator, in the name of the revolution, takes power over the method and orders the pupil, in an authoritarian way, using this difference that exists. This is my position, and therefore it makes me surprised when it is said that I defend a nondirective position. Thus, Freire advocated a directive role for teachers that nonetheless respected student autonomy and built upon student knowledge.

Freire offers a critique of authoritarian teacher-student relationships, in favour of democratic classrooms characterized by shared power and dialogue among teachers and students. Authoritarian teachers, according to Freire, believe they know everything and students know nothing; think and act on behalf of students and do all the talking while students meekly listen; enforce their discipline and choices on the compliant students; set up their authority in opposition to the freedom of the students. He argues that this authoritarian stance converts students into mere objects, eliciting either rebellious defiance by students, or apathy, excessive obedience, uncritical conformity, lack of resistance against authoritarian discourse, self-abnegation, and fear of freedom. Freire’s pedagogy of liberation is premised instead on a dialogical relationship between teacher and students, founded on shared power and mutual dialogue. Rather than seeing the teacher as imparting all knowledge to students, this model validates the popular experiential knowledge that students also bring into the classroom. It promotes the idea that teachers can
also learn from their students. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. Mind-set, control-mechanisms, a standardized curriculum, a rigid rule structure and top-down hierarchy guide the authoritarian nature of schools. A critical pedagogue views that the term authority has multiple meanings and can be democratically negotiated. The teacher educator is an authority over his/her subject matter. Teachers and students share each other’s knowledge. Therefore learning is reciprocal and dialogical, favours understanding and respects the cultural diversity of all students, and develops relationship of caring, sharing and nurturing each other.

4.2.11. Enabling Dialogue for Critical Consciousness

Dialogue, Freire wrote, is “the encounter between men [sic], mediated by the world, in order to name [that is, to change] the world”. He insisted that dialogical encounters help students to develop critical consciousness of social, political, and economic contradictions so that they can take action against them.

Critical consciousness requires analyzing, interactively and through dialogue. It ultimately requires questioning the status quo rather than taking it as given. Education as the development of a critical awareness among popular educated, understood as awareness of injustice and the need to change it, requires creation of methodologies of work based on the collective construction of knowledge, dialogue and action. From an emphasis on developing critical class consciousness, there should be a move towards awareness of the value of the subjective features of the poorer sections of society and involvement of all aspects of them as autonomous
persons: culture, physicality, emotions, values, will, critical thinking and creative imagination.

Democracy is not received as a gift. Democracy is fought for. Freire’s politicization of education and educationalization of politics gave rise to a critical reading of social reality, in particular of the injustices created or exacerbated by the capitalist system, and of the role which the latter plays in reproducing the social order in the education system. Helping to turn the poorer sections of the population into protagonists of this social transformation is strengthening them and their organizations and movements through education.

4.2.12. The Culture of Silence Vs Culture of Critique

Freire believes that the oppressed live in a “culture of silence”. He argues in Pedagogy in Process that students in traditional schools “are brought to the learning process, not as persons invited to know the knowledge of the past so that, recognizing its limitations, they can know more. On the contrary, what is proposed for them is the passive acceptance of packaged knowledge”. He claims that “An education of answers does not at all help the curiosity that is indispensable in the cognitive process”. He suggests that “only an education of questioning can trigger, motivate, and reinforce curiosity”.

Freire defines the world in terms of two distinct classes: the oppressor and the oppressed. The oppressor is characterized as one who domesticates through the banking concept. Through exploitation and unjust treatment, the autonomy of the oppressed and her intellectual freedom are restricted. In this situation, the oppressed
are the object upon which the oppressor acts as the subject. Freire argues that this denial of “subjectivity in the process of transforming the world and history is naïve and simplistic. It is to admit the impossible: a world without people”. He claims that “World and human beings do not exist apart from each other, they exist in constant interaction”. Freire states: the ability of humans to plan and shape the world for their future needs is what separates man from animals. The oppressed majority must be taught to imagine a better way so that they can shape their future and thereby become more human. Growing to us is something more than growing to the trees or the animals that, unlike us, cannot take their own growth as an object of their preoccupation. For us, growing is a process in which we can intervene.

This means that “we need to challenge our creative capacity and curiosity”. Freire points out, “the source of knowledge lies in inquiry, in questioning, or in the very act of asking questions”. This intellectual freedom is not provided in traditional schools because it goes against the philosophy of domination. He states: “The oppressor knows full well that this intervention would not be to his interest. What is to his interest is for the people to continue in a state of submission, impotent in the face of oppressive reality”. He maintains that “in an authoritarian atmosphere, the challenge implicit in a question tends to be regarded as an attack on authority. And even when that is not openly admitted, the experience finishes up with the suggestion that it is not always convenient to ask questions”. Then, obviously, he says, “a power elite will not enjoy putting in place and practicing a pedagogical form or expression that adds to the social contradictions which reveal the power of the elite classes. It would be naïve to think that power elite would reveal itself through a
pedagogical process that, in the end, would work against the elite itself. Liberating education, by contrast, provides students with this opportunity.

Freire suggests that emancipatory education rises “the awareness of the students or the oppressed so that they become subjects, rather than objects, of the world”. He argues that “the proper education worthy of its name is the one that transforms the student from object status to that of subject through problem posing pedagogy. This emancipatory education, which is based on problem-solving, Freire argues, assists students in overcoming this culture of silence imposed on them. He says, “Education as the practice of freedom as opposed to education as the practice of domination denies that man is abstract, isolated, independent, and unattached to the world; it also denies that the world exists as a reality apart from people”. Freire argues that we “cannot be fully human with the restriction of our freedom. He further argues that “this restriction and oppression make us passive robots, who do not have feelings and autonomy”. We need to overcome this restriction to become fully human, he argues. Therefore, we can only grow once we are able to break these chains of silence.

4.2.13. Conscientization of the Students

Conscientização is “the process by which humans become more aware of the sources of their oppression.” Freire ask the educators “to challenge the learner’s naïve curiosity in order that they can both share criticalness. That is how an educational practice can affirm itself as the unveiling of hidden truth.” To arouse critical thinking, students are provided with problems from real-life—not hypothetical ones. In the process of coding and decoding, students concentrate on the problem.
They critically think and ask questions in order to understand the problem, before trying to find solutions to deal with it. However, this is not enough. Freire says, “No one can overcome weakness without recognizing it.” Once we understand our weakness then we need to take an action in order to deal with the weakness. Therefore, only when we understand and recognize the injustices in our lives can we become conscious of these inequalities. However, it is through consciousness and praxis together that we can attempt to change these injustices and inequalities in our lives.

By growth Freire means both understanding the injustice and inequalities in one’s life, and taking action in order to deal with these injustices and inequalities. One cannot attain conscientização just by thinking critically; conscientização for Freire also requires realizing the inequalities and injustices in one’s life and then having the will to take action in order to counter these injustices and inequalities imposed.

Conscientization for Freire is a critical attempt to make man see the reality of the world around him. It takes place when illiterates come together in dialogue to discuss situations affecting their existence. Conscientization is thus a dialectical process that relates critical reflection on past action to the continuing struggle for a better future. This process of consciousness awareness cannot be carried out by proxy, that is, no one conscientizes anyone else.

As a literacy process, Conscientization is dialectical between the theory and practice or between reflection and action. It is in respect of this that dialogue becomes a necessary condition for liberating literacy. Hence for Freire the object of literacy
education is liberation through Conscientization and its method is dialogue when there is the relationship between literacy and Conscientization.

Conscientization is a process of growing and developing in awareness whose target is to know and transform reality. Freire however, employed the concept as a method of transformation. He also employed it to analyze literacy as a political project. The first task in this analysis is to make the illiterates aware of the cause of their plight. The first causes are social conditions which shape man and his consciousness. Thus the first task is to change the illiterate consciousness. This attempt to change their consciousness is, at the same time, an attempt to make literacy education the practice of the freed. It is in this sense that conscientization and literacy are described as coincidental. The outcome of this relation is a literacy practice that is highly political. Literacy education at this point is a liberational act that involves a radical resistance of dehumanizing and unjust social economic and political conditions. This resistance leads to a destruction of these structures after which man is in a position to create new structures.

While considering the social problems in dialogue with other men the illiterate is led into a situation of intentional critical thinking which enables him according to Freire to undertake "a rational and rigorous critique" of the social, political and economic situations around them. Conscientization thus links the literacy process with the existential situations of the learners. This link plus the skill of literacy education empowers the illiterates to begin to take steps towards transforming the ugly elements of their existential situations. The empowerment through literacy seeks to make learners understand their world and their present position in it and also to make them
undertake efforts to change the adverse social, economic and political situations. Thus economic, social and political empowerment emanate from the symmetrical relation between literacy education and Conscientization in Freire’s philosophy.

4.2.14. Education, Not as reproduction

Theoretically, the school reproduces and acts as an agent of status quo. However, in modern development discourse schooling is considered an agent of social transformation as desired and designed by value frameworks of Constitutions across the world. Education is not only an academic affair but basically and intensively a political affair. Therefore, to make pupil with emergent values as against established values of hierarchy, the school needs to provide a critical space for children to engage freely with knowledge and values. The logical necessity of this context is the adoption of critical pedagogy in the schools that provides a critical space, for children, to negotiate with existing practices and understandings critically in the light of emergent value frame.

At the heart of Friere’s unique view of education lies what he calls critical consciousness or Conscientization. This term meaning, consciousness raising is about understanding the social and political contradictions of the world and taking action against them in one’s own life. According to Freire, freedom will be the result of praxis or informed action when a balance between theory and practice is achieved. Understanding these contradictions is necessary especially in situations of extreme poverty, because oppressors create a culture of silence that propagates a negative self-image of the oppressed. The student/learner needs a critical consciousness to
realize that this culture of silence is created to oppress. With a critical consciousness it will become evident that freedom from oppression is possible through engaged political change. One of the valuable contributions of Freire is his insistence on commitment to praxis as the constant interplay between reflection and action such that one fuels the other in order to transform oppressive reality.

For Freire, being human implies constantly transforming one’s world: to speak a true word is to transform the world. Freire even prioritizes transformation above the act of reflection. Freire’s prioritizing of change leads to a bias against tradition, and a tendency to regard traditional culture and thought as either oppressive or naive, and inherently needing to be rejected or transformed. Freire’s bias towards transformation and towards defining truth in contrast to Indian tradition leads to a challenging and confrontational stance that resists authoritative statements, and tends to favour revolution against tradition. The questioning, confrontational approach implied by Freire’s methodology may prove to be potential site of conflict with the more consensual, harmonious patterns of interaction favoured in Indian society. Freire’s critical consciousness is characterized by highly permeable, interrogative, restless and dialogical forms of life.

4.3. Indian System of Education

4.3.1. **Moksha as aim of Indian traditional System of Education is not Social**

According to Vedic educational philosophy, human beings are essentially spiritual beings that form part of a larger ultimate source or reality. **Moksha** involves deliverance from material reality, which is marked by suffering and unfulfilled needs
and desires, in order to achieve a true knowledge of the absolute or ultimate reality. Each individual negotiates multiple roles and must carry out the responsibilities and duties ascribed to those roles. *Dharma* involves a sense of duty, social obligation, morality, and responsibility, which provides order to the universe. The achievement of *moksha* in turn leads to liberation from the cycle of *karma*, another central defining concept in Hindu thought. *Karma* refers to a framework whereby human actions operate within a cause-effect paradigm, where the positive or negative nature of one’s actions determines the consequences of those actions. It is through living by one’s *dharma*, while being mindful of the *karma* associated with one’s actions, that one breaks the cycle of rebirth and achieves *moksha*. The concepts of *moksha, karma* and *dharma* are quintessential in shaping Hindu life and culture and their influence extends to various facets of Indian life, including education.

Liberation for Freire is a humanizing process in the context of oppressive and dehumanizing structures. This process of humanization includes two dimensions of liberation praxis as Freire explains: reflection and action. Mere activism (action) lacks the basis or the originating moment of liberation and mere verbalism (reflection) does not encompass the practical movements of the liberation struggle. Liberation need to arise from the unique dynamism between acting and reflection. Liberation presupposes reflection, action (praxis) and active involvement of the oppressed in their struggle. They must perceive reality of their existence. Attempting to liberate the oppressed without their reflective participation in action is to treat them like objects to be rescued from a burning building. At all stages of liberation, the
oppressed must see themselves as people engaged in the ontological and historical vocation of becoming fully human. Liberation can be achieved only through reflection on their concrete historical reality, which varies in accordance with historical conditions. Action follows reflection, reflection on reality will call for action.

About the relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed, Paulo Freire says “the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed’ is ‘to liberate themselves and their oppressors as well’ who ‘oppress, exploit and rape by virtue of their power’”. Thus the struggle for humanization consists in breaking the cycles of injustice, exploitation and oppression. In these roles, those who commit injustice—the oppressors, do not only deny freedom to those they oppress, they also risk their own humanity, because oppressor’s consciousness “tends to transform everything surrounding it into an object of its domination”. The oppressed too internalize this oppression as natural; they too initially become ‘sub-oppressors’, and a role, which they begin to think, is the ‘ideal model of humanity’. To break this cycle, Freire suggests, a revolution of ideas must take place. But how would the oppressed resolve this oppressor-oppressed contradiction? This contradiction can be resolved through what Freire calls as “the pedagogy of the oppressed, a pedagogy forged with, not for, the oppressed (be they individuals or groups). By confronting “reality critically, simultaneously objectifying and acting upon that reality”, the oppressed can begin to transform themselves from objects to Subjects. According to Freire, this makes the beginning of revolution as the first stage.

4.3.2. Instrument to Social Liberation not Self-Realization
The chief aim of education according to Buddhism is the attainment of Nirvana or deliverance or liberation by fulfilling the rules and regulations of Buddhism. The knowledge and learning can only completely abolish the burden of sorrow and ignorance. Buddhism opines that the path of emancipation is possible in the existing life of human beings. The ascetics and monks after achieving Nirvana divested themselves of the complex and complicated earthly bondage and attained finally Mukti, the Supreme end of life. But this form of consciousness differs from critical consciousness does not come naturally as a by-product of economic change but out of critical education. Therefore, the student must come to the realization that they are the makers of culture and transformers of the world through gaining and experimenting with knowledge. The student is a subject in the world and with the world, no longer just an object or a participant in the culture of silence. This new levels of awareness can be reached, wherein the learner is no longer an object of others’ will, but a self-determining subject. Therefore, the ultimate goal of critical education is the creation of a democratic society or liberative society whereas just adopting rules and regulations one tends to become legalistic and not earthly bound.

4.3.3. Hierarchical Relationship of Indian Education

Cultural construct that shapes the culture of pedagogy in India is the organization of society based on hierarchical relationships and structures. Indian society is based on an elaborately hierarchical social order where each individual is part of a complex, stable network of relationships throughout the course of their life, with individual preferences and ambitions subordinated to the welfare of the
extended family and *jati* (caste) communities. School socializes children into this particular value framework. It influences the modes of thinking and knowledge. Therefore, socialization of children into caste value framework, always, necessarily requires knowledge that legitimizes the value framework. This is against transformative role of education of Freire. The way the Indian system of constructing its knowledge is based on ‘culture of silence’ where anti-dialogical cultural action aims at mythicising contradictions, thereby hoping to avoid (or hinder in so far as possible) the radical transformation of reality. It explicitly or implicitly aims to preserve, within the social structure, situations which favour its own agents. It would never accept a transformation of the structure sufficiently radical to overcome its antagonistic contradictions. In cultural synthesis, the actors who come from ‘another world’ to the world of the people do so not as invaders. They do not come to teach or to transmit or to give anything, but rather to learn, with the people, about the people’s world.

4.3.4. Indian Education as an Ideology of Dominant Class

The meaning/objective of education is defined by ideology of dominant class and it is considered legitimate and desirable. For retaining their own vested interests and to maintain their status quo, they overlooked the negative effects of this elitist education – its colonial character, its arrogance and indifference to the experiences of the larger community. Education was not free from elitism, arrogance and cultural snobbery. The colonial masters, assuming paternalistic attitude, sought to retain their superiority and educate the ignorant/superstitious masses but failing to
establish an organic relationship with the oppressed that led to marginalization and alienation and not towards liberating them. Paulo Freire believes that education can never be neutral. Given human nature, the power-games we all play on one another and our children, and the inevitable conditioning of relationships between parent and child, and student and teacher, it just is not realistic to suppose that the student can ever be entirely and absolutely free to come to his own conclusions.

4.3.5. Indian Education Reproduces Massive Inequality

A massive inequality prevails in education between men and women as well as between the general population and disadvantaged groups. The economically poor have been hardly touched by higher education. There are inequalities between rural and urban, various ethnic, linguistic and religious communities. The system has either strengthened or created new ones. The blame for the situation should be placed on society as a whole - to a great extent this disparity is more the result of economic and occupational problems and cultural biases of society than the accessibility of educational facilities. Paulo Freire is of the view, since oppressor is minority, he will not allow unification of the majority, and he will divide the oppressed. The oppressor or imperialist promotes a select group of leaders and not the community. But all the time they claim to defend the poor but they act in favour of their vested interests by a culture of the invader/oppressor, their world view is imposed. They mould the minds of the oppressed, they chose. The oppressors also seek to prevent people from uniting through dialogue. If any individual decides to begin a fight for
liberation, he is stigmatized, included on the black list, all in an effort to avoid the historically inevitable realization of freedom.

For Freire, being human implies constantly transforming one’s world: to speak a true word is to transform the world. Freire even prioritizes transformation above the act of reflection. Freire’s prioritizing of change leads to a bias against tradition, and a tendency to regard traditional culture and thought as either oppressive or naive, and inherently needing to be rejected or transformed. Freire’s bias towards transformation and towards defining truth in contrast to Indian tradition leads to a challenging and confrontational stance that resists authoritative statements, and tends to favour revolution against tradition. The questioning, confrontational approach implied by Freire’s methodology may prove to be potential site of conflict with the more consensual, harmonious patterns of interaction favoured in Indian society. Freire’s critical consciousness is characterized by highly permeable, interrogative, restless and dialogical forms of life. Freirean thought can provide a critique of the passivity that characterizes traditional Indian culture and its tendency toward accepting rather than challenging social inequality. Based on the two kinds of reality that are embedded in the Hindu psyche, glaring economic and social inequalities are viewed as merely part of the fleeting worldly reality, and thus can never feel as real as the ultimate spiritual reality. This cultural belief thus inhibits a real commitment to overcoming social inequality, since material suffering is to be accepted and used for inner development rather than striving to alter illusory worldly realities. In particular, Freire provides a
breakdown of how the banking model of education serves to stimulate the credulity of students, and to indoctrinate the oppressed classes to passively accept and adapt to oppressive social conditions. The theory and practice of banking education serve this end quite efficiently.

By placing too great an emphasis on transformation of traditional forms of consciousness, critical pedagogy tends to undermine traditional modes of thought, and in the process goes against the deep interconnection, reciprocity and respect for traditional and intergenerational knowledge that characterizes many indigenous cultures, including in India. Freirean epistemology could benefit from analyzing the ways in which so called traditional cultures already engage in critical reflection. In the process, Freire overlooks the rich repositories of wisdom and critical acumen already contained in traditional cultures. The conflict between Freirean and Indian worldviews highlights the need for critical pedagogy to more deeply engage with and affirm traditional knowledge and intergenerational learning, rather than creating a sharp dichotomy between traditional and critical consciousness and seeing the two as mutually exclusive.

4.3.6. Interdisciplinarity: Self-Learning Process

Paulo Freire considers interdisciplinary education as “a process of answering a question, solving a problem, or addressing a topic that is too broad or complex to be dealt with by a single discipline or profession.” This interdisciplinary curriculum aims to incorporate a variety of skill-based activities that will take the students on a journey, which will eventually lead them to initiate a self-reflective course of action.
By understanding the history of colonialism through the lenses of literature, history and art, students will be challenged to examine the different dimensions of this theme in their nation’s history and ultimately its contributions on a more personal level. The intention behind an overarching essential question of such a vast scope was for students to consider the concept of identity as tied to colonialism from numerous perspectives. Ultimately, the hope is that curriculum will stimulate the students to consider the influencing factors that shape their own mindsets and belief systems. This curriculum is most influenced by Freirean pedagogy in its aim to connect educational subject matter to students’ personal experiences. By raising the question of how colonialism shapes identity, this curriculum encourages students to examine the effects of colonialism on various social structures, starting from literature, moving into local art and history, including their own families and communities and landing ultimately on themselves. The aim is that both students and educator challenge one another’s assertions, thereby raising the level of consciousness, promoting meaningful dialogue and enhancing the process of discovery together. These Freirean principles of liberatory education provide the basis for a student-centered educational environment, toward which this curriculum aspires. In the words of John Dewey, “Education therefore is a process of living and not a preparation for future living.”

4.3.7. Harmony with Nature

Just as intellectual training involves achieving harmony with one’s total affiliations with the one reality, his social milieu and with one’s own interior and
exterior realms of being, so also it involves environmental harmony with Nature and its rhythm of successive mutations. Man learns many things from his natural habitat. The universe is perhaps the greatest library filled with unwritten but powerfully eloquent sources of learning.

In order to learn from nature, one should not do violence to it nor disturb the ecological balance. Instead, man has to listen to the humming of the dawn and the dusk, attend to the flashing of lightening, feel the pulse of life in plants, trees, animals, and human kind; he should also watch the movements of the planets, stars, and other luminaries of the sky; meditate on the abyss and expanse of the oceans; sense the thrills of the clouds, and the chills of the winds; wonder at the drops of dews, because all these realities of Nature communicate numerous messages to those who are open to listen, see, touch, taste, smell, understand and realise them patiently.

The village schools and the *gurukulas, muttah, and vidyapeethas* of higher learning were situated on the banks of rivers in the valleys of the mountains and in the woods near the villages. In all these places man was placed for learning in the laps of Nature offering him scope to grow in response to the challenges of Nature. Alone in the woods or pastures, man gets emotive responses in the form of fear, wonder, joy or peace, reawakening in him the consciousness of self which he would otherwise lose, if at all they had it in the crowd of the city. Such an environmental congeniality of nature in which an education centre is situated, helps the students to eliminate the disharmonies and tension of inner life by providing scope for reflection, meditation, self-integration and deeper awareness of one’s connaturality with the totality of Reality which manifests in diverse forms in the cosmic, order. Actually it is such
sylvan schools (*parnasalas*) and houses of masters (*gurukulas*) that had developed some of the fine ideals of life, noble thoughts of culture and higher perspectives of values in Indian heritage.

**4.3.8. Education Praxis**

Human activity consists of action and reflection: it is *praxis*, it is a transformation of the word. And as *praxis*, it requires theory to illumine it. Human activity is theory and practice: it is reflection and action. It cannot be reduced to either verbalism or activity. Freire stresses the importance of praxis in education. *Praxis* is reflection as well as action that are inextricably intertwined; it is the dialogue on which all effective relationships and advancements rely. Without analyzing and learning from experiences and events, no learning occurs; “For apart from inquiry, apart from the praxis, men cannot be truly human. Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other.” This invention and re-invention are in perpetual emergence and are endless. Experiences change people, understanding and knowledge. New knowledge is produced in the classroom from the interaction of students’ and teachers’ knowledge. These changes require new identity and a new invention or re-invention of the concept.

Freire emphasizes that praxis cannot be divided into stages of reflection and action; they must occur simultaneously and continuously. Constant re-evaluation enables a quick learning process and adjustments to action. The reflection is not removed from the event as it will or did occur. These experiences generate new ideas and comprehension of situations, events, and people. This applies to liberation
education. Compartmentalizing activities, subjects or people prevents the learning or movement from being effective and efficient because the actions are disconnected from reality. The practicality and relevance of knowledge are at best underutilized, at worst completely lost.

An inseparable component of understanding the world through action is reflection. In a dialectical manner, reflection leads to new action. That is, action and reflection are not separate moments of knowing. For, on the one hand, reflection that is not ultimately accompanied by action to transform the world is meaningless, alienating rhetoric. On the other hand, action that is not critically analyzed cannot sustain progressive change. Without reflection, people cannot learn from each other’s successes and mistakes; particular activities need to be evaluated in relation to larger collective goals. Only through praxis—reflection and action dialectically interacting to re-create our perception and description of reality—can people become subjects in control of organizing their society. This praxis is not neutral. Knowledge does not exist apart from how and why it is used, and in whose interest. In Freire’s view, people produce knowledge to humanize themselves. Overcoming dehumanization involves resolving the fundamental contradiction of our epoch: domination against liberation.

4.3.9. Need of Epistemological Change

Freire insists that knowledge is not static; that there is no dichotomy between objectivity and subjectivity or between reflection and action; and that knowledge is not neutral. For Freire, knowledge is continually created and re-created as people act and reflect on the world. Knowledge, therefore, is not fixed permanently in the
abstract properties of objects, but is a process where gaining existing knowledge and producing new knowledge are “two moments in the same cycle”. Embedded in this notion is the recognition that knowledge requires subjects; objects to be known are necessary, but they are not sufficient. Knowledge necessitates the curious presence of subjects confronted with the world. It requires their transforming action on reality. It demands a constant searching. In the learning process the only person who really learns is s/he who re-invents that learning.

Knowledge, therefore, is a negotiated product emerging from the interaction of human consciousness and reality; it is produced as we, individually and collectively, search and try to make sense of our world. Necessarily, then, the human act of sense-making implies the subjectivity of our descriptions of the world. However, contrary to the view that subjective statements contain no connection to objective reality and that there exist objective statements about the world, unpolluted by subjective perspectives, Freire insists that subjectivity and objectivity are not separate ways of knowing. To deny the importance of subjectivity in the process of transforming the world and history is…to admit the impossible: a world without people….On the other hand, the denial of objectivity in analysis or action…postulates people without a world…[and] denies action itself by denying objective reality. Because of the unity between subjectivity and objectivity, people cannot completely know particular aspects of the world—no knowledge is finished or infallible. As humans change, so does the knowledge they produce.

4.3.10. Ethical Dimension
Ethically, critical pedagogy stresses the importance of understanding what actually happens in classrooms and other educational settings by raising questions regarding what knowledge is of most worth, what it means to know something and desire knowledge, and what future is being imagined within particular modes of pedagogy. It also takes seriously the important relationship between how we learn and how we act as individual and social agents. In this instance, critical pedagogy is concerned with teaching students not only how to think, but also how to assume a measure of individual and social responsibility - namely, what it means to be responsible for one's actions as part of a broader attempt to be an engaged citizen who can participate individually and collectively in society in order to expand and deepen the possibilities of democratic public life. Critical pedagogy at its most ambitious level offers an approach for educators to foster the conditions that enable students to think critically, take risks and reflect on the connection between the knowledge they gain and the obligations of civic and social responsibility.

In relation to ethics, Paulo constantly stresses, believes that there can be no education that does not adopt and pursue an ethical commitment. But, he does not reduce this merely to the inclusion of values as a teaching subject, a functionalist approach to what is a fashionable topic in education. It seems to me that one of the main aberrations of current approaches is the wish to convert the ethical commitment (social, political and ecological) of human beings – in this case, of educators – into a subject or a series of classes that teach values. It should be remembered that in Mexico, the only aspect of the curriculum that we ever had – and which came close to
the topic in any way – was civics. In speaking of Paulo’s ethical thinking, we are obviously not talking about adding or removing subjects and/or teaching classes on values, explaining in theoretical terms what is meant by freedom, fraternity and justice, etc. We mean placing an ethical focus at the centre of every practical and theoretical activity that is educational in an individual or a social sense. Freire views, The practice of education is all of this: affectivity, enjoyment, academic ability and technical mastery in the service of change. We cannot throw out thinking that requires us continually to renew our ethical commitment. To do this would be to doubt whether we should maintain whatever commitment we made years ago to a better world. Commitment came through awareness, making us realise that the world was unjust and full of contradictions, increasing marginalization and violence, lack of respect for human rights, acute poverty, etc.

4.3.11. Holistic View of Life and Reality

Ancient Indian educational system depended on the classical Indian philosophical theory of knowledge demanding the correspondence of reality with morality. True knowledge required sequence between theory of reality and theory of morality (rules of action). The former defined the vision while the latter described the scheme of actions to be performed in view of achieving the goals of life. This implied the fact that true learning aimed at achieving perfect harmony between the perception of truth and the execution of it in actual life. Such a scheme took full account of the fact that life includes also death and both form the whole truth of living one’s life authentically. This gives an integral vision of the life as well as a sense of proportion in which the theoretical and the practical, the physical and the spiritual, the perishable
and the permanent interest and values of life are clearly defined and proportionately differentiated in action. Man cannot take life seriously unless he has some glimpse of the whole scheme of life with regard to its origin, mutation, and final dissolution into something whole about which he can think holistically. He would take the biological process of his life in the context of the total life-process and in relation to the inner self of his being. He may expand and descend by means of the contemplation on the enveloping presence of all Pervading Reality on the one hand, by intuition into the inner essence of all things in relation to the One on the other. Thus, he may devote himself to a study of the most fundamental and ultimate truths of life and may not care very much for half-truths or intermediate truths. His main aim of study and thereby of life is to find out and follow consistently the proper sadhana for resolving the problem of suffering and death. This requires the knowledge of whole truth of which life and death are only parts. He perceives that it is the individual ego that is of the nature of the transient world that dies and not the whole or the Absolute in him.\textsuperscript{cdlvii} Human person (individual) is a psycho-somatic-pneumatic integral whole which comprises element from the three spheres of reality which is described as \textit{jiva-jigat-atman}. The individual has to realize in himself the convergence of this tripolar reality by awakening his consciousness about the various elementary composition of his being, his inner potentiality to grow and be transformed unto the one unity and self-sufficiency for aching inner harmony between the conflicting forces and impulses that act upon him. The rule of harmony is inter-dependence of these levels operating in man. The Indian educational apparatus as it operated in ancient time has two functions. i) to discover the human personality as a continuum rather than as a
continuum of disconnected elements ii) to make the human self the meeting point of heaven and earth – God and world or spirit and matter. With such an integral vision, of the unity of reality in him, man had to overcome the inhibitions caused by pure rationalization, symbolization or dramatization of his life.

According to Shankara’s Advaita Philosophy, the ultimate aim of education is to prepare the child for the realization of the *Brahma*. The Soul and God are one and the same reality. Hence, education should make the child realize his self in all its perspectives to the fullest possible extent so that he could identify and realize the Ultimate Reality, which Shankara divides into three, namely reality as it appears, reality in our normal every day experience and the absolute reality. The notion of self is viewed largely against a social fabric, as embedded within a social context. The process of psychosocial development in Indian society is aimed not so much at individuation and independence, but on developing interdependence and a sense of duty and responsibility toward the group. This in turn leads to a duty-based code of living that defines clear roles and responsibilities governing the network of social relationships in which individuals are embedded. According to the framework of *dharma* and *karma*, each individual occupies a dignified, rightful caste-based position and function within society, and contributes to the cosmic order as long as they fulfil their appropriate roles and obligations.

For Freire, education is not meant for the realization of the self, and it "is not the transference of knowledge, but the encounter of Subjects in dialogue in search of the significance of the object of knowing and thinking". Education, for Freire,
rises out of a genuine, mutual challenging and questioning. This model for education, therefore, seems to advocate the act of educating oneself with and through others over the traditional content of that education; in fact, Friere’s overtly challenges this traditional understanding of education.

Indian educational model of interaction can be seen as embedded within the hierarchical social framework and the collective decision-making features of Hindu culture, where the fact that only the teacher asks questions reflects the importance of the teacher’s authority and possession of knowledge. The duty-based worldview shared by teachers renders them more comfortable with being assigned prescribed tasks and duties by the state or school authorities. Indian education system projects obviously false situation where the teacher acts as if he has absolute knowledge relative to the students. Such a system can only be maintained by violence because it is untrue. This is why students in schools become disaffected; they have been forcibly disengaged from the learning process by being denied their right to truth, to make a direct connection with it. It is an assault on their being.

Education is not only shaped by the cultural worldview prevalent in India, but is also active in shaping and perpetuating this worldview, since students are continually being socialized into the culture of learning in India and the worldview in which this culture is embedded. The school and its activities have been integrated meaningfully by teachers, children and the community. To the extent that these features of Indian classroom are not ritualistic or idiosyncratic, reforming specific features or introducing an alternative model like critical pedagogy requires that we
holistically address this larger cultural framework and embedded patterns of thinking that shape education in India.

Dialogical pedagogy makes an essential contribution to the Indian culture of pedagogy in its commitment to praxis in order to transform oppressive conditions, empowering oppressed groups to challenge the unjust order rather than accepting it as the way things are. However, critical pedagogy’s exaltation of transformative action can lead to a bias against tradition, and a skeptical impulse to reject traditional patterns of thought without focusing on the valuable elements in them. It can also generate a combative approach where students are encouraged to criticize authoritative texts and statements, including those made by the teacher which may be inappropriate in an Indian classroom setting.

4.5. Conclusion

Journeying through the reinvigorating concepts on education travelled by Paulo Freire is a joyful experience. The principles of pedagogy portrayed by the Brazilian educationist makes the readers reinvent the major objective of education that of liberation of not only the oppressed but also the oppressors. His pilgrimage into the concepts of humanization of the oppressed as well as the oppressors enlightens his readers. The liberating force of conscientizacao is the beaming light that makes the modern scenario of education shine and shows the path to the modern educationalists. His reinvented theories on education are placed side by side with the theories pertaining education on the Indian scenario. Education for liberation should be a path-opener to those who are engulfed in Brahminic
hegemony and authoritarianism. The other concepts of Freire that are highlighted in this chapter are: Conscientizing every learner with social liberation and not just with self-realization, interdisciplinarity to develop de-skilling and re-skilled and thus to visualize education as a process of living and of just a preparation for future living. In the light of Freirian pedagogy, an attempt has been made to present a critique of Indian education.