

Critical Education

Volume 6 Number 21

November 15, 2015

ISSN 1920-4125

Education, the State, and Market Anatomy of Neoliberal Impact

Ravi Kumar
South Asian University

Citation: Kumar, R. (2015). Education, the state, and market: Anatomy of neoliberal impact. *Critical Education*, 6(21). Retrieved from <http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/criticaled/article/view/185901>

Abstract

This article is excerpted from Education, State and Market: Anatomy of Neoliberal Impact, edited Ravi Kumar and published by Aakar Books (New Delhi, 2014). The book presents a set of papers that illuminate in profound ways how the wide-angle historical frames provided by Marxist analysis facilitate our understanding of the details embedded in national and more local educational contexts. Neoliberalism attacks human dignity. The consequences of social, economic, and educational policies that exacerbate inequality, magnify exploitation, and undermine personal and social freedoms are clearly analyzed by each of the contributors. The circumstances are dire and readers will most certainly be outraged as they learn how neoliberal policies and practices reduce the process of education to a commodity and teachers and learners to elements in formula for the relentless production of profit. This volume presents a clear and compelling analysis of how neoliberal thought and practice has transformed education at the policy level in India and in the process distorted the official aims of education as well as social relations among teachers and learners. Most importantly, however, these chapters provide insights into how we might channel our rage against neoliberal capitalist mechanisms into the creation of new visions of resistance to educational practices that privilege profits over people.



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and *Critical Education*, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available from <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or *Critical Education*. *Critical Education* is published by

the Institute for Critical Educational Studies and housed at the University of British Columbia. Articles are indexed by EBSCO Education Research Complete and Directory of Open Access Journals.

The Context

The physical landscape has altered- in not only cities but also the countryside. In the vast open fields on two sides of the highways stand ugly looking buildings thrusting down our imagination the delicate story of a resurgent India. Malls, plush apartments, education institutions, and everything that could be put to sale surround us as consumers to buy the product. This is the new landscape- the cities, towns, once nondescript district headquarters- everywhere, the narrative of a homogenous world, a universalized idea of 'market is the regulator and provider of everything' can be seen. Those who argued for local/mini narratives and denounced the category of 'universal' are confronted with this new world order. A new narrative has become dominant – one that breeds unprecedented and starker inequality, thwarts the idea of social justice, and converts social concerns into marketable commodities.¹

The neo-liberal world, nonetheless, sells the name dream to everyone by saying *you can also buy it*, that *you only need to work hard* to let the economy/ company grow at a faster pace. In other words, the distant world of happiness embodied in the ability to buy everything, may be drawn closer, it says, by ensuring that capital accumulation must happen unhindered, without revealing that the accumulated capital is not likely to be shared, in a manner wherein the dreams can be bought by everyone. Like the uncivil neo-rich driving with their blinding headlights on and loud music to escape the realities of the world, the new economy seeks to blind you with the size of its buildings, flyovers, plush offices, residences, and markets all around: highways replete with shops selling degrees in medicine, engineering, and everything possible under the sky without much of quality control; the city with mall and hotel -like schools and inaccessible cinema halls that make entertainment class specific; the arrogance of money that spits at the face of anything you considered 'civil' and 'decent' few decades back; and a battery of research institutions that would constantly pump you with information through their pink newspapers and magazines about how good life has become, measuring quality through, everything that market does and provides for. The new economy hides poverty from naked eye, it makes your city look as if the poor do not exist. The motto seems to be, *hide them in every possible way, by throwing them out to the peripheries of the city or outside of it.*

This is the new world- the neoliberal world, where everything has been commoditized and quantified. It tells you that there is *possibility* everywhere, but when it comes to providing concessions and subsidies, it harps on the tune of *resource crunch*. We have seen the brazenness and ugliness of money power in the past decade or so in India. Every now and then, money that is littered around through scams, et cetera, shows how much resource actually we have to fund education and health for all.² However, the official documents reiterate how important it is to bring in the private sector if the whole of India is to be educated. It argues that there is a dearth of resources and that the State on its own cannot manage to provide education and healthcare to

¹ The increasing violence against women in cities like Delhi has led to new mobile applications and new commodities to flourish themselves as if they would end the violence against women. Hence, rather than questioning the patriarchies which inevitably culminate into violence against women the consumers are being effectively told that market can also provide solutions to the problem.

² A quick calculation of amount of money eaten up by the corporate houses, political elite and bureaucracy through scams such as Fodder Scam, Coal Scam, 2G Scam, Commonwealth Games Scam, Allotment of Gas Reserves Scam, Madhu Koda Scam, etc., reveal that there is no dearth of resources and if this money could be used for providing education and health services through state managed institutions to everybody then the situation would have been different in this country.

all its citizens. This is the dominant discourse coming from the State as well as non-State actors in neoliberal times. As recent as the 12th Five Year Plan document says that ‘Private providers (including NGOs and non-profits) can play an important role in elementary education. Their legitimate role in expanding elementary education needs to be recognized and a flexible approach needs to be adopted to encourage them to invest in the sector’ (GoI 2013, p.64).

Commoditization of everything that surrounds us is happening. We have been told recently by the Nestle Chairman Peter Brabeck that water should be treated as a commodity: “‘Water is a commodity with a market value like any other foodstuff,” says Brabeck. “Personally I believe it’s better to give a foodstuff a value so that we’re all aware it has a price”, he concluded, in remarks that could be construed as supportive of the idea of privatizing the world’s water supply’ (*Politix*, 2013).

In practice, water has been privatized much before with rivers and their water being handed over to private enterprises to generate electricity and sell them for profiteering. People are upset and angry over how rivers being handed over in this manner become invisible and inaccessible to common people (Mazoomdar, 2013). There is an overt centralization of decision-making that has happened under the new economic regime. Riding on the rhetoric of participatory democracy and decision-making it actually alienates masses from the process. And this not only becomes clearer from the way natural resources are being handed out to the corporate houses across the country, but also from the way natural resources are being handed out to the corporate houses across the country, but also from the way the participatory institutions are subverted by the existing class, caste, and gendered inequalities in societies. The way school level committees function across the country are a proof of this myopic conception of ‘participative institutions.’

In the bigger picture, participation in democratic process is becoming a costly affair as the number of millionaires increase in the Parliament. So, those making policies would obviously be working in the interests of those whose class interests they represent. Some of the estimates point out that there has been a quantum jump in the number of millionaires in the Indian Parliament.

Hence, the context within which one would have to analyse the neoliberal impact on education is a complex one- wherein each and every aspect of social, political, and cultural life is determined by the new economic regime. This is accompanied by declining organized and sustained resistance against it as well. There are sporadic protests but they are politically unclear and misplaced against the new regime, which provides it a smooth sail in pursuit of its goals. In order to better understand the above context, it is relevant to look at what neoliberalism actually does to our lives in general and education in particular.

Characterising Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism arrived when the prosperity and the stability ‘controlled and capitalism’ was shaken by the ‘oil shocks’ of 1970s as the price of oil uncontrollably increased overnight. The new ‘liberals’ or the neoliberals heralded the inefficacy of the Keynesian model and laid down the principle of minimal or no-State intervention and more powers to the market to work according to its ‘will’ (Steger & Roy, 2010). It needs to be recalled that economists like John Maynard Keynes, in the aftermath of the Great Depression, ‘advocated massive government spending in a time of economic crisis to create new jobs and life consumer spending.’ By

advocating this, he was challenging 'classical liberal beliefs that the market mechanism would naturally correct itself in the event of an economic crisis and return to an equilibrium at full employment (Steger & Roy 2010, p. 6). Hence, Keynes or the British Prime Minister Clement Attlee and American President Franklin D Roosevelt were not critiquing market but they were only opposed to its unlimited and unbridled freedom to operate. They were emphasizing a certain kind of regulation and control by the State. It was in this context that one could see nationalization of industries and certain sectors happening in the post World War II phase.

When neoliberalism arrived, it was arguing for a self-regulated market and its expansion in all possible arenas with a minimal role for the State. It hardly leaves any sphere of our lives untouched- such is its desire to colonize our existence. 'Neoliberalism straddles a wide range of social, political and economic phenomena at different levels of complexity' (Saad-Filho & Johnston 2005, p.1). Scholars argue that one may look at neoliberalism as (1) an ideology, (2) a mode of governance, and (3) a policy package (Steger & Roy, 2010).

As an ideology, its chief advocates are 'global power elites that include managers and executives of large transnational corporations, corporate lobbyists, influential journalists and public relations specialists, intellectuals writing for a large public audience, celebrities and top entertainers, state bureaucrats, and politicians' (Steger & Roy, 2010, p. 11). In fact, Harvey argues that 'One substantial core of rising class power under neoliberalism lies.....with the CEOs, the key operators on corporate boards, and the leaders in the financial, legal and technical apparatuses that surround this inner sanctum of capitalist activity' (Harvey 2007, p.33). The task of this class is also to create a public discourse that portrays the idealized images of a consumerist and free market world. In other words, they are responsible as ideological apparatuses to weave a world of false dreams, web of illusions, and a range of aspirations that can never be achieved. Consequently, one gets what McLaren and Farahmandpur (2005, p. 193) write

Capitalism has become so intensified that it represses our ability to acknowledge the process of repression itself. It naturalizes repression so completely that the current economic horror has come to be seen as part of the everyday woof and warp of things that we have blithely come to name 'the daily grind.' Consequently, even progressive educators who are vigorously engaged in the debate fail to address the fateful implications of capitalism's confiscation of freedom and kidnapping of hope.

Neoliberalism is indubitably the hegemonic discourse today, as it pervades the 'was of thought to the point where it has become incorporated into the common-sense way many of us interpret, live in, and understand the world' (Harvey 2007, p. 3).

As a mode of governance, neoliberalism bases itself on principles, that are 'rooted in entrepreneurial values, such as, competitiveness, self-interest, and decentralization. It celebrates individual empowerment and the devolution of central state power to smaller localized units. Such a neoliberal mode of governance adopts the self-regulating free market as the model for proper government' (Steger & Roy, 2010, p.12). Brown argues that neoliberalism needs to be seen 'as a political rationality,' which 'also involves a specific and consequential organization of the social, the subject, and the state' (p. 693). He cautions that this political rationality is not constituted as a 'spill over' from economic neoliberalism but as an 'imposition of the market rationality.' He argues:

A political rationality is not equivalent to an ideology stemming from or masking an economic reality, nor is it merely a spillover effect of the economic on the political or the social...a political rationality is a specific form of normative political reason organizing the political sphere, governance practices, and citizenship. A political rationality governs the say-able, the intelligible, and the truth criteria of these domains. Thus, while neoliberal political rationality is based on a certain conception of the market, its organization of governance and the social is not merely the result of leak age from the economic to other spheres but rather of the explicit imposition of a particular form of market rationality on these spheres. Neoliberalism as a form of political reasoning that articulates the nature and meaning of the political, the social, and the subject must be underscored because it is through this form and articulation that its usurpation of other more democratic rationalities occurs. (Brown, 2006, p. 693-694).

The idea of public good becomes an alien concept for neoliberal order as it strives to reduce everything to the private sphere. Giroux says that

Not only does neoliberalism bankrupt public funds, hollow out public services, limit the vocabulary and imagery available to recognize anti-democratic forms of power, and produce narrow models of individual agency, it also undermines the critical functions of any viable democracy by under cutting the ability of individuals to engage in the continuous translation between public considerations and private interests by collapsing the public into the realm of the private. (Giroux 2004, p. 494)

There are no longer ‘public servants’ or ‘public offices’; there are only enterprises, entrepreneurs and workers, who would very often be told that they are part of a family- that is, the enterprise. Hence, it was no surprise when, ‘in the early 1980s, a novel model of public administration known as “new public management” took the world’s stable bureaucracies by storm. Operationalizing the neoliberal model of governance for public servants, it redefined citizens as “customers” or “clients” and encouraged administration to cultivate an “entrepreneurial spirit”’ (Steger & Roy 2010, p. 13).

The State becomes a facilitator of corporate interests and works towards ensuring profit maximization for them. It manipulates legislature, executive and judiciary to the advantage of corporations. There are instances when it ‘assumes much of the risk while the private sector takes most of the profits. If necessary, furthermore, the neoliberal state will resort to coercive legislation and policing tactics (anti-picketing rules, for example) to disperse or repress collective forms of opposition to corporate power’ (Harvey, 2007, p. 77). What can explain this better than the fact that the Indian State gives land to corporate business houses at subsidized rates and even acquires and buys land for them? The Delhi government, after privatizing electricity supply, keeps paying the corporate house huge amount of subsidy, whereas the corporation keeps making profit through exorbitant electricity prices. The Indian State has written off Rs. four lakh crores as tax waivers to corporate houses just between 2004-05 and 2011-12 (Sainath, 2012).

On the policy front, the neo liberal mantra is ‘(1) deregulation (of the economy); (2) liberalization (of trade and industry); and (3) privatization (of state owned enterprises).’ In the process of implementing this, one experiences: massive tax cuts (especially for businesses and

high- income earners); reduction of social services and welfare programmes; replacing welfare with ‘workfare’; use of interest rates by independent central banks to keep inflation in check (even at the risk of increasing unemployment); the downsizing of government; tax havens for domestic and foreign corporations willing to invest in designated economic zones; new commercial urban spaces shaped by market imperatives; anti-unionization drives in the name of enhancing productivity and ‘labour flexibility’; removal of controls on global financial and trade flows; regional and global integration of national economies; and the creation of new political institutions, think tanks, and practices designed to reproduce the neoliberal paradigm. (Steger & Roy, 2010, p.14).

Neoliberalism is, undoubtedly, a system of governance, an effort to dictate and determine how we live our lives, and a doctrine that believes in taking away the rights of those who cannot pay or afford to live in this world where you would pay money even to pee, where everything gets into private hands- from your individual security to the collective good, obviously aimed at feeding the insatiable appetite of the private capital. Capitalism, as usual, does its best to ensure that the system runs in best possible way so as to minimize acts of resistance and optimize the possibility of accumulation. It is for this that ‘neoliberal capitalism performs the dual task of using education to train workers for service sector jobs and produce lifelong consumers ’(Giroux & Giroux 2006; p. 21).

Education becomes one of prime instruments to generate what can be termed as a segmented labour force for capital and, simultaneously, to facilitate the rule of capital. This new avatar has hardly added anything worth saying that it can be deemed as even marginally better than the other avatars. And that is so because of what it does:

1. The market becomes the organizing principle of all aspects of our life- political, economic, social, and cultural- as commodification pervades all of them.
2. The distinction between public and private diminishes/ vanishes as private takes over everything that is public, including the sanctified so-called security systems.
3. Politics increasingly and overtly becomes a domain of the ruling elite, as number of millionaires and billionaires rise in formal democratic institutions.
4. While ‘resource crunch’ becomes an excuse for the State’s inability to manage health, education, pension, et cetera, the State, simultaneously, doles out huge monetary benefits to corporate houses as tax waivers and subsidies.
5. Poverty increases in real terms (if not in definitional terms of the State, which manipulates its definitions and figures) and so does the gap between those who can afford to be buyers in the new commodified economy and those who cannot.
6. The market expands and creates monopolies in such a way as to give impression that it can cater to everyone (according to their capacity and, thus, not ignoring any segment of population) trying to generate illusions about its predatory nature.
7. Through an unprecedented control over ideological apparatuses, the market creates a chimera of ‘hope’ and ‘aspirations’ that keep telling the masses about unlimited

‘possibilities’ under neoliberal capitalism. This temporal intoxication is broken by crises that the economy faces repeatedly.

8. By pumping into individual imagination illusory impressions of the world, it tries to push its darker side into oblivion (such as farmer suicides, hunger deaths, malnourishment, environmental catastrophes, et cetera) though they resurface time and again.
9. The idea of ‘social justice’ is destroyed as the State reduces its role and hands everything to the market, which believes in its criteria of ‘competition’ and mutilated notion of ‘merit’. Social concerns and historical constructs are no longer factored in the idea of ‘justice’.
10. There is growing intolerance towards *dissent* and *dialogue*. It is seen as hampering the smooth functioning of the institution and is taken as an ‘attack’ on its endeavour to attain the goals that it has set for itself.
11. It is more aggressive in terms of governance. Hence, it not only manipulates the existing bourgeois democratic structures such as the Parliament or regulatory bodies such as University Grants Commission but also resorts to physical violence against those who resist.
12. There is increasing surveillance of public as well as private lives. This emanates from the fear that private capital has come from masses engaging in acts of resistance and subversion. In the words of Giroux: ‘Situated within an expanding culture of fear, market freedoms seem securely grounded in a defense of national security, capital, and property rights. When coupled with a media driven culture of panic and hyped-up levels of insecurity, surviving public spaces are increasingly monitored and militarized’ (Giroux, 2004, p. 496).
13. Because it believes in manipulating the rules of governance, it sets into motion a vicious cycle wherein the same gets replicated at the level of each and every institution. Instead of following a process of framing rules and regulations, the institutions make, modify, and change them everyday, as per their convenience. This allows them to facilitate better surveillance and control, and to provide them the opportunity to factor in the interests of market.

Within the field of education, this phenomenon is the dominant discourse today, irrespective of public or private institutions. The spread of this demon that eats away public money and neglects the interests of the masses has generated great amount of work globally specifically looking at how it impacts education. These works have ranged from how corporatization and simultaneous militarization of the educational institutions have happened to the mutation of educational policies as the State takes upon the role of the ‘agent of capital’ much more aggressively (Saltman 2003; Robertson 2005; Hill & Kumar 2008). Spread of the neoliberal virus across different physical locations has been explored at a more fundamental level (Hill 2009; Hill & Rosskom 2008). However, most of these works have emerged from the Western context and relatively lesser number from the South Asian context, which is no different when it comes to neoliberal arguments becoming dominant or getting translated into State

policies. A need was always there which would look at the case of India and how the impact of neoliberalism is changing the education system.

Neoliberalism and Education in India

The education system in India never ever experienced such a huge transformation in such a short span of time. It is not only the quantum of change that needs to be analysed and understood but also the violent form that it takes- a violence that is not only momentarily physical but also intellectually coercive, compelling one to get claustrophobic within the confines of a university ideally considered a dialogic space. Visit one of the largest state universities in India - Delhi University - and you would get that feeling or do an ethnography of how mechanisms of university governance work in close collaboration with a group of teachers, it would reveal to you the pain and agony that most teachers and students undergo without having any say in what to teach and how to teach.

This transformation is located within a situation that has entrenched the rule of capital, as its owners march fearlessly and shamelessly on a campaign to expand the accumulation of capital in a situation where the anti systemic forces in politics are also weakened. This transformation tried closing debates on a Common School System, put a closure to even the possibility of equality within elementary education or higher education, mobilized the liberal voices in its favour through different committees and commissions, formulated and implemented everything that would suit the rule of capital through synchronizing the imaginations of judiciary, executive, and legislature, and sent a clear message that the 'popular will' would not necessarily be factored in policies and politics. The distance between what people need and what is 'provided' by the State is dissonant. This must not appear surprising for anybody when the role of the State is determined by the needs, and therefore, designs of private capital. Inequality would continue to be there in all spheres of service delivery – from the education system to the health system- till the State is controlled by and works at the behest of owners of capital.

While there are evident changes at the policy level – from owning up the economy to commodifying education as any other to be bought in the marketplace- there are different, and often complex, ways of effecting these changes. The direct, coercive, undemocratic policymaking practice of the State is one while using the so called progressive voices to create an illusion of 'democracy' and 'welfarism' is another. So, the State opens up education to the private sector in an unprecedented manner (Kumar, 2012) but it also mustered support for its plan to corporatize and homogenize education system through committees such as the Yahspal Committee (Chandra 2012, p. 160-1; Kumar 2012, p. 145). At a micro level, this could also be seen in some of the committees appointed at the provincial level (GoB 2007). In the process of doing this, the State, for private capital to prosper, has done away with the history of welfarism and negated all its commitments made during the phase of its welfarist avatar (Sadgopal 2006). Analysts argue that the State has gradually put an end to possibilities of a long standing commitment such as the Common School System (Sadgopal 2010) and the arguments of 'something is better than nothing' has become a justification for any move towards withdrawal of the State from its basic responsibilities.

One of the thrust areas of the neoliberal assault can be seen in the changes in the content of what is being taught. The decline of social sciences and predominance of technology institutes are only one dimension of it. The other dimension is the nature of teaching-learning that happens

in these institutions. Opened not as part of a long-standing vision to enhance the disciplines and their knowledge stock, these institutions have been mushrooming everywhere. South India is no longer the only hub of private institutions; one can now find them all over the country. Over 250 technical and management institutes had shut down as of 2012 (Basu 2012). Even social sciences have been trying to join the rat-race of being a job-oriented (read market-oriented) discipline by offering as many diplomas as they can. The idea of knowledge as critical and as an instrument that teaches the idea of liberation has been skillfully and deftly set aside. As McLaren and Farahmandpur write '...even progressive educators who are vigorously engaged in the debate over global capitalism and theories that oppose one another within it frequently fail to address the fateful implications of capitalism's confiscation of freedom and kidnapping of hope' (2005, p. 193).

The idea of education has changed. It is no longer something which generates hope and dares one to dream for a world free of inequality and exploitation. The 'good education' equips one with the necessary skills to serve the factories of different types—from automobile units to the universities. It is developed in tandem with the changing notion of what is a 'good society'. 'The logic of privatization and free trade—where social labour is the means and measure of value and surplus social labour lies at the heart of profit—now odiously shapes archetypes of citizenship, manages our perceptions of what should constitute the 'good society', and produce necessary functions for capital in relation to labour' (McLaren 2005, p. 23). The dominant idea of education reproduced through the school and university system is about reproducing the system in which one lives. And the changes that one experiences in the system are in that direction. It is this new idea, which quantifies everything, standardizes everything and looks for ever-new ways of measuring how well students and teachers are serving (or going to serve) the demands of the economy and the thought processes necessary for sustaining the system. The principles and concepts of autonomy, innovation, and social good have changed and they are now interpreted in a way that would cater to the needs of the market.

In the same way as everything undergoes a change, the teaching labour force has become more and more a part of the trends in the labour market. Contractualization and informalization of this labour force is quite common and on the anvil, whether it is school education or the university system. One of the functions of job insecurity is to instill a sense of fidelity through the fear of losing the job. This function makes one a much better carrier of dominant ideas across the disciplinary spectrum. In some of them it may appear subdued, while in others, it is overt. In order to have an education system that contextualizes itself in the social order and teaches and learns its dynamics to get over its scorn and repression, it becomes essential that the issues of the teaching labour force are understood well.

These transformations happened—though not without opposition, which has been fragmented and politically not united—while the anti-systemic political formations became increasingly social democratic and, hence, weakened all across the country. The politics on the streets diminished as the politics of legislative revolution overtook a section of the left imagination. The synchrony between the two and the significance of the street fights took a backseat. Vanaik puts this more succinctly when he says that 'the balance between parliamentary-electoral pursuits and extra-parliamentary mobilizational activity must always be tilted strongly towards the latter' (2013, p. 13). The imagination of Left politics, which could have been one of the forces confronting the neoliberalization of education, has turned out to be myopic.

This myopia emerges as a greater result of the failure to ground education within working class politics and the class question, rather than a result of the arguments of mere accessibility (which is no doubt also important). A critique that could transcend into a sphere that establishes the linkages between capitalism and the consequent educational policies and the politics of knowledge production has been very weak. Hence, there have been non-party pressure groups and individuals that emerged as an opposition to this whole educational crisis in the country. How far their programmatic understanding and analysis becomes politically significant can be analysed separately. There have been, no doubt, powerful analyses emerging out of this context, which laid threadbare the nuanced ways in which political rationality guised as 'governance' has consistently manipulated and destroyed the State managed education (see Sadgopal 2006; 2010).

The changes that have taken place can be mapped at different layers and that kind of work is yet to be done at a more elaborate level in India. These different layers would include: (1) how changes have occurred at the policy level; (2) how do they impact at the layers of pedagogy within classrooms/disciplinary orientations or at the larger levels of language; and (3) how one would imagine the possibilities of resistance in this context.

The chapters in this volume are an effort to understand precisely these three aspects. As already stated, there is an increasing need to bring together more work to understand the nuances of how everyday structures of our life, which would include the sites of learning, are affected by neoliberal capitalism and its unceasing desire to devour everything that comes its way. This book offers only a miniscule part of that exercise. While the chapters by Hargopal and Madhu Prasad deal with the issues of how policies work in the sphere of higher education, Vikas Gupta has tried to historically locate the shift that has happened from welfarism to neoliberalism in the educational sphere. Radhika Menon brings insights from the field to understand how these processes work, wherein the commodification of education affects the worst those who cannot afford to buy it. Srinivas Burra and Rajesh Bhattacharya show how disciplines get shaped in conjunction with the dominant economic logic of the times. Bhattacharya argues that the 'contemporary practices of teaching and research in economics in India don't prepare students, teachers and researchers to engage with the Indian political economy in a sophisticated and socially relevant way' and he explains why it happens. Similarly, Burra's paper narrates the historical trajectory that led to the shaping of the discipline of legal studies and how global factors have shaped the discipline. These factors may not become apparent when one looks at them as a participant, but taking a macro and longitudinal view always allows one to look at the aspects that influence them. Harjinder Singh 'Laltu' and Samir Karmakar have tried to look at the language question and how it is confronted with a crisis in contemporary times. Ramesh Pattnaik argues for a mass movement to ensure that education remains fully managed by the State. He writes, 'It is time for activists and academics alike to go to the masses to integrate their subjective theories with the objective experience of the people in order to advance the campaign for a democratic education system'. On the other hand, Anil Sadgopal argues for building an emancipatory discourse using the works and discourses of Jvotiba Phule, B. R. Ambedkar, and Gandhi. Prince Gajendra Babu, in his short reflective piece, shows how resistance is happening within the limits of given legal-juridical boundaries.

The volume establishes beyond doubt how perilous is neoliberalism for education. However, there is a need to not only further explore the theme but also move beyond by looking into possibilities and alternatives.

References

- Basu, M. (2012, November 20). 58 tech institutes apply for closure to AICTE', *Indian Express*. Retrieved from <http://www.indianexpress.com/news/58-tech-institutes-apply-for-closure-to-aide/1033484/>
- Brown, W. (December, 2006). American nightmare: Neoliberalism, neoconservatism, and de-democratisation. *Political Theory*, 34(6), 690-714
- Chandra, P. (2012). The struggle and its generalization: The case of the university. In R. Kumari (Ed.), *Education and the reproduction of capital: neoliberal knowledge and counterstrategies* (pp., 153-170), New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giroux, H. A. (2004). Public pedagogy and the politics of neoliberalism: Making the political more pedagogical. *Policy Futures in Education*, 2(3 & 4), 494-503.
- Giroux, H. A., & Giroux, S. S. (2006). Challenging neoliberalism's new world order: The promise of critical pedagogy. *Cultural Studies! Critical Methodologies*, 6(1), 21-32
- Government of Bihar. (2007, June 8)). *Report of the common school system commission*. Patna: Government of Bihar
- GoI. (2013). *Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-2017)*, Social Sectors, Vol. 111. New Delhi: Sage.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, D., & Kumar, R. (Eds.). (2008). *Global neoliberalism and education and its consequences*. London: Routledge
- Hill, D., & Roskarn, E. (Eds.). (2008). *The developing world and state education: Neoliberal depredation and egalitarian alternatives*. New York: Routledge.
- Hill, D. (2009). *The rich world and the impoverishment of education: Diminishing democracy, equity and workers' rights*. London: Routledge
- Kumar, R. (2010). Education and the politics of capital: perspective and agenda for resistance against neoliberalism. *Social Scientist*, 38(9/12), 51-60
- Kumar, R. (2012). The charge of neoliberal capital and higher education in India. *Journal Of Critical Education Policy Studies*, 10(2). Retrieved from <http://www.iceps.com/?pageID=article&articleID=267>
- Mazoomdar, J. (2013). Another disaster in the making. *Tehelka*, Retrieved from <http://www.tehelka.com/another-disaster-in-the-making>
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching against global capitalism and new imperialism: A critical pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- McLaren, P. (2005) *Capitalists and conquerors: A critical pedagogy against empire*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Politix. (2013). Nestle chairman: Water should not be a human right. Retrieved from <http://politix.topix.c0m/homepage/5677-nestle-chairman-water-should-not-be-a-human-right>

- Robertson, T. (2005). Class issues: A critical ethnography of corporate domination within the classroom. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 3(2). Retrieved from <http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=52>
- Sadgopal, A. (2006). Dilution, distortion and diversion: a post- jomtien reflection on the education policy. In R. Kumar (Ed.), *The crisis of elementary education in India*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Sadgopal, A. (2010). Right to education vs. right to education act. *Social Scientist*, 38(9-12), 17-50.
- Sainath, P. (2012, March 26.). To fix BPI, nix CPL. *The Hindu*. Retrieved from <http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/columns/sainath/article3223573.ece>
- Saltman, K. J., & Gabbard, D. A. (Eds.). (2003) *Education As enforcement: The militarization and corporatization of schools*. New York: Routledge.
- Steger, M. B., & Roy, R. K. (2010) *Neoliberalism: A short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vanaik, A. (2012). Future perspectives for the mainstream Indian left. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 47(41), 12-15.

Author

Ravi Kumar is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Sociology at South Asian University. He is co-editor of two book series: “Social Movements, Dissent and Transformative Action” (Routledge) and “Conversations on/for South Asia” (Aakar Books) as well as Associate Editor of *Society and Culture in South Asia* (Sage) and Editor (South Asia) of *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*. His research includes political economy of identity politics, social movements, neoliberal impact on education and processes of knowledge production.

Critical Education

criticaleducation.org

ISSN 1920-4175

Editors

Stephen Petrina, *University of British Columbia*
Sandra Mathison, *University of British Columbia*
E. Wayne Ross, *University of British Columbia*

Associate Editors

Abraham P. DeLeon, *University of Texas at San Antonio*
Adam Renner, 1970-2010

Editors

Stephen Petrina, *University of British Columbia*
Sandra Mathison, *University of British Columbia*
E. Wayne Ross, *University of British Columbia*

Associate Editors

Abraham P. DeLeon, *University of Texas at San Antonio*
Adam Renner, 1970-2010

Editorial Collective

Faith Ann Agostinone, *Aurora University*
Wayne Au, *University of Washington, Bothell*
Jeff Bale, *University of Toronto*
Theodorea Regina Berry, *U of Texas, San Antonio*
Amy Brown, *University of Pennsylvania*
Paul R. Carr, *Université du Québec en Outaouais*
Lisa Cary, *Murdoch University*
Anthony J. Castro, *University of Missouri, Columbia*
Alexander Cuenca, *Saint Louis University*
Noah De Lissovoy, *The University of Texas, Austin*
Kent den Heyer, *University of Alberta*
Gustavo Fischman, *Arizona State University*
Stephen C. Fleury, *Le Moyne College*
Derek R. Ford, *Syracuse University*
Four Arrows, *Fielding Graduate University*
Melissa Freeman, *University of Georgia*
David Gabbard, *Boise State University*
Rich Gibson, *San Diego State University*
Rebecca Goldstein, *Montclair State University*
Julie Gorlewski, *SUNY at New Paltz*
Panayota Gounari, *UMass, Boston*
Sandy Grande, *Connecticut College*
Todd S. Hawley, *Kent State University*
Dave Hill, *Anglia Ruskin University*
Nathalia E. Jaramillo, *University of Auckland*
Richard Kahn, *Antioch University Los Angeles*
Kathleen Kesson, *Long Island University*
Philip E. Kovacs, *University of Alabama, Huntsville*
Ravi Kumar, *South Asia University*
Saville Kushner, *University of Auckland*
Zeus Leonardo, *University of California, Berkeley*
John Lupinacci, *Washington State University*
Darren E. Lund, *University of Calgary*
Curry Stephenson Malott, *West Chester University*
Gregory Martin, *University of Technology, Sydney*
Rebecca Martusewicz, *Eastern Michigan University*
Cris Mayo, *University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*
Peter Mayo, *University of Malta*
Peter McLaren, *University of California, Los Angeles*
João Paraskeva, *UMass, Dartmouth*
Brad J. Porfilio, *California State University, East Bay*
Kenneth J. Saltman, *UMass, Dartmouth*
Doug Selwyn, *SUNY at Plattsburgh*
Özlem Sensoy, *Simon Fraser University*
Patrick Shannon, *Penn State University*
John Smyth, *University of Huddersfield*
Mark Stern, *Colgate University*
Beth Sondel, *North Carolina State University*
Hannah Spector, *Penn State University, Harrisburg*
Linda Ware, *SUNY at Geneseo*