

***The Matrix of Education, Power and Empowerment:
Where Do We Stand?***

Neeta Arora, University of Delhi, India

The Asian Conference on Education 2015
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Traversing the matrix of 'education', 'power' and 'empowerment' brings us to some understanding of each and their nature, for example, all of them have some implicit value dimension. Interestingly, 'empowerment' has 'power' as core word, but 'empowerment' is widely preferred, used and more valued than 'power'. An evolving and comprehensive conception of power is one with four dimensions: 'power over', 'power to', 'power with' and 'power within' (VenKlasen & Miller).

The idea of 'power within' comes to mean empowerment. Being significant yet not so tangible a notion, 'Empowerment' seems to largely overlap with, if not same as, autonomy, an expression used earlier. They are about courage to make life- choices and being responsible. Both notions stand on appreciation of limits of mind/reason. This has implications for how we see ourselves, world and knowledge. And Education, being necessarily based on some conception of human nature and worthwhile knowledge, can possibly gear for empowerment, if it is so valuable.

An important question emerging here is, whether or how far our education has power to empower. By observing some educational scenarios both at macro and micro levels we try to analyse and get insights about what in education stands for what kind of power and what stands in way of/limits empowerment. What kind of conception of education and its implementation may be suited to promote empowerment may be complex to address (yet worth looking into alternatives ventures to educate) and remain an issue of lasting concern, perhaps in newer terms.

iafor

The International Academic Forum

www.iafor.org

It seems quite justifiable to look at education as a powerful means to empower people or bring about any change. What is it about education that makes it powerful? How do we conceive empowerment of people, is it different from their power? Does education have power to empower?

To understand the power of education we try to look at the nature and concept of 'education. Its meaning can range from acquiring skills, developing capacities, dispositions or qualities and potentials, yet all of these lean on some understanding of 'what is learnable', 'what is worth learning' and 'what is it to be educated'. The idea of education is necessarily tied to how we perceive learner/ourselves, as well as what is worth learning/knowledge.

Is learner a person, human agent or simply evolving species of human being? How all can human beings be conceived? What is pre-determined for humans and what are they free to determine about themselves? If educational concern is the promotion of personhood, ultimately autonomous, what form should education take? But if learner is to develop into a social, rational being, then enculturation and socialisation are the educative processes.

We do come across contrary conceptions of education- both descriptive (of learning experiences and situations) and prescriptive/normative(based on desirability). Some view of human betterment always guides educational decisions, whether utilitarian ends, external to activity where education is viewed as an instrument, or the non-instrumentalist view, wherein education is intrinsically good(like for autonomy), not a device designed to produce humans of a certain kind(like civic or productive) for some end. Yet both understandings are normative in character (Carr, 2003). Some value reference (desirability or worthwhileness) is inherent to educational decisions and to any educational theory(Moore,1974).

Arriving at three criteria central to the concept of education, Peters says, the first is concerned with the development of desirable states of mind in the transmission of what is worthwhile to those who care about it. Secondly, education is concerned with the acquisition of a body of knowledge and understanding that gives some kind of cognitive perspective to person's activities, transforming their outlook. Thirdly, the process of education involves at least a minimal voluntary participation in the process (Peters, 1966).

Hence education has power due to its essential normative nature, it has power to transform people for their betterment, and such transformation is not possible without willingness on the part of learners (assumption on learner).It is in the freedom and responsibility of choosing what to value and envision for human existence that empowers education. Education, through the curriculum and teaching-learning activities can exercise some power to influence learners for envisioned life.

Power may be understood as ability to meet ends, get the wanted (Boulding, 1989). Empowerment lies in choosing our ends and wants rightly. The wants and ends are human valuations and decisions or choice, a potential to be realised, a vision of life and world integral to it (Boulding,1989).In choosing our orientation guides us to be productive, destructive and/or integrative (later ref). Therefore, all choices partly

depend on our capacity to generate possibilities and will to choose kind of power. This capacity is affected by our learning (education).

The power, in one of its dimensions (Lukes,1974), can work as visible and open enforcements that can take form of conflicts, domination, resistance and violence. Power can also be structurally played to control, and lastly most unobservable form of power that becomes willing compliance, where the interests of the dominated seem to be met through the dominant. It is important to observe that these are all zero-sum models of power, because when power of one increases, that of other(s) decreases, total remains constant.

Somewhat wider understanding of power comes from Boulding (Boulding 1989; Susann,1992; and Rowlands, 1995) who distinguishes three kinds of power with their interesting representations:

Threat power represented as ‘the stick’ is the power to destroy which sufficiently covers all three versions given by Lukes, where exploitation and injustice are inherent along with lack of trust and respect. Hatred and competition are at its base.

Economic power as ‘the carrot’ which is the ‘power to’ do things, is about abilities and capacities and therefore generative or productive power. The power here is about strengthening and developing, to produce and enable, and not to control or overpower. There is often no conflict of interests and encouragement, persuasion, trust work well. Integrative power or ‘the hug’ is the most energising of all as it is “the power to create such relationships as love, respect, friendship, legitimacy, and so on”(Susann, 1992). It is self-generated, expansive and works to empower many more.

The three powers co-exist in multidimensional, complex, vague and qualitative manner, yet are observable. The sources, objects and responses to power can be very many (Boulding,1989).

Boulding (109-117) finds important aspects of integrative power as love, which at best is general benevolence or concern for welfare, as mutuality, respect, and inclusiveness or expansiveness which makes us relish differences and variety and helps us face uncertainties or resolve dilemmas. With this, even bullying, punishing, regulating and production can be gainful and effective, and without it, the other two also lose and harm.

He places the integrative power as the ultimate power which legitimises all other powers. I see a lot of integrative power as ‘power within’ (VenKlasen and Miller, 2002) which has to do with a person’s sense of self-worth and self-knowledge. It includes an ability to recognise individual differences while respecting others. It involves capacity to imagine, generate possibilities, hope in search for dignity and fulfilment.

The power of domination expressed as ‘power over’ is seen to stand on fear and grounded in absence of trust and respect and therefore destructive stands opposed to ‘power with’ which is an expression of empowerment as construed by Kreisberg (as cited in Juceviciene and Vizigirardiite, 2012). For him, empowerment¹, in general is about being able to influence, sharing and expanding in both personal and political

¹ Empowerment in political sense, means power to participate in the decision making process, make changes and is needed for democracy. Psychologically, empowerment is about self-esteem and confidence.

aspects and leads to increasing control over one's life, and in decisions related to their own life.

Rowlands (1995) examines 'empowerment' emerging from the root notion of power, can have a range of meanings according to the intentions, explicit or implicit, of the user, which get expressed in the four forms (Rowlands,1995) of 'power', i.e., 'power over', 'power to', 'power with' and 'power within'.

Power, with the intent to control/dominate keeps some powerless or disempowered, thus sustaining inequalities and injustice. This keeps people conditioned and governable (befitting Luke's zero-sum conceptions). Power when enables for certain ends, empowers to certain extent (to produce and earn, thereby develop some abilities in people). Power with intention to generate love and respect are most empowering as it makes people deeply confident, free, expansive and responsible.

Empowerment may be seen on a continuous range of power towards positive conceptions, like those by Boulding, where power is depicted as increasing freedom from control, conditioning, violence and divisive forces and has the courage to live responsively with love and in harmony. Empowerment is always seen as an intrinsically valuable state to live, the most responsible way to live/be, therefore, a worthwhile aim of education. It enables to choose better things for better life, is about sharing and integrating all within us and at its core, empowerment is fundamentally a psychological or psycho-social processes involving development of self-confidence and self-esteem, a sense of agency, and 'dignity', almost meaning self-respect and self-worth (Rowlands, 1995).

Kabeer (as cited in Rowlands, 1995, p 211) considers that "Such power cannot be given; it has to be self-generated", and that is why it is 'power within' because it requires the 'un-doing' of 'internalised oppression' and appears to be the transformative 'key' that opens 'locks' on the empowerment door. This develops with voluntary analysis and reflection besides "social networks, organisational strength, solidarity and sense of not being alone".

Empowerment is essentially personal; the other dimensions of empowerment are the relational, and the collective dimensions² (Rowlands,1995, p188). The personal dimension of empowerment is most important, also because he saw that collective empowerment is possible only with some critical mass of personally empowered individuals.

The normativity in notions of power and empowerment is quite clear, although can be viewed as continuous or contrasting. We see that **power can exist in opposing forms, destructive and generative, oppressive and empowering/emancipating**. This comes from Boulding, Lyotard and Foucault, although Lyotard and Foucault do see power besides intention also.

Personal empowerment, the core of all empowerment amounts to seeing what really matters to us, thereby willfully taking responsibility of conscious choice of one's own state and letting go off the rest. It makes us more sensitive, compassionate, connected to our surroundings, respectful, fair, and free from fear and thus need to conform or

² The personal-developing then sense of self and individual confidence and capacity (which involves undoing the effects of internalised oppression); the relational- of close relationships and support through them; and the collective dimension based on a co-operative rather than a competitive model.

urge to protest. One becomes free from manipulations and conditions and need to manipulate.

These seemingly characterise what we call, **autonomy** (an old notion and concern in education). Autonomy, originating in Greek, means self-rule or self-governance, meaning self-determination and close to self-regulation and self-directedness. Freedom of individual is implicit in these ways of living, and so is responsibility.

This can require and imply a range of human abilities – rationality, critical thinking, reflection, reasonability, (which lead to ownership of ones beliefs, deliberations, judgment and thus self-reliance, self-sufficiency), individuality (identity, subjectivity), reaching potential or excellence, authenticity, being true to oneself, integrity, consciousness, agency, purposiveness, and more. How these differ and relate or which is central has many debates in its discourse. Whether it is a state of mind or of being, how far is it possible, what can be done (through education also) to develop autonomy are relevant questions.

Pring (1984) quite comprehensively deals with various conceptions of autonomy, considering it to be an ideal, such that to be educated would mean to be autonomous in personal, social and moral aspects of life³. In one sense it means the ability to make up one's own mind about what is right or wrong, thereby not depending on authority or tradition and standing by one's thoughts and values for oneself because of free choice, and not social props. Crudely speaking, autonomy is about the quality of thinking and will.

Autonomy is viewed by Piaget and Kohlberg as a transformation necessarily preceded by heteronomy⁴, a non- autonomous stage. Without initial respect for experience and understanding of our tradition, the authoritative assertions, the reflection and thought may not be mature enough to make us autonomous. It would take all of one's authentic rational, critical and reflective abilities to create values for oneself and not change with fashion or under pressure, in the complex world full of contradictions (Pring, p74). These do not develop with disrespect for others, or with rigidity or rebellion.

Kant sees the human agency as rational agency, which enables him to be a morally autonomous person (Carr,2003). It is implied that mind is not logically prior to agency. Human person in some way is normative than a biological construct. Further, 'moral goodness' and 'rational self' are desirable and found compatible with personal autonomy (Cooper, 1986), like autonomy is compatible with communal life (Peters, 1973). Autonomy, as self-governance, may be seen as a constellation of relatively deep rooted important dispositions, knowledge of which helps anticipate and explain actions...in the stretch of total behaviour, in some sense expression of core self (Kaufman, 1973). Education can contribute

³ by both Dearden 1972, Peters 1981, as cited by Pring 1984.

⁴ Heteronomy: that is, prescribed rules and values from social agencies play important role in developing freedom from them. Another meaning refers to the sense of personal identity (individuality). One grows up to be a distinct person such that with one's own values and sense of purpose in life, one does not go astray smothered by differences, changes around or popular trends.

to develop some of these dispositions, even if cannot take total responsibility for autonomy.

Autonomy is demonstrated by high self-actualisers, and is based on human motives, that is, our degree of understanding and awareness of 'why we want what we want' determines the way we become. We can see that addressing the question 'why we want what we want' involves choosing to think critically, reason, reflect, which can lead to clarity in intent, responsible decisions and values. Some "inner-directed dimension" is demonstrated in all our decisions in self-actualisers (McMartin, 1995).

The term '**self-actualisation**' came with humanistic theorists, namely, Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers⁵. Our goal-directedness and intentions play a strong role in creating ourselves through seeking self-fulfillment, expressing our need for self-actualisation in our unique ways (as cited in McMartin, 1995).

Maslow and Rogers characterise self-actualising persons as those who live in the present, experience fully, not rigidly go by rules or in automated mode. They resist enculturation, decide which norms they will follow and live by 'law of their own'. Being honest, open to all experiences- ecstatic to painful, they trust themselves, are at ease, emotionally stable and live without pretence. They are more willing to extend, expand and learn on even through bad situations, are simple and spontaneous, creative and 'fully- functional'. Their choices are intrinsically guided and therefore favour fulfilment, satisfaction, psychological and social well-being, acceptance and respect rather than money, success, fame, approval or power (McMartin,1995). Their capacity to distinguish the means from ends enables them to transform means to ends. They pay respectful attention to their inner selves to determine whether they really like something.

The kind of 'goal orientation' determines our kind of motivation (intrinsic or extrinsic). We can conceptualise goals as possible selves. The extent and nature of our efforts to reach goals that are especially important to us are internally related to our self-concept and self-esteem (McMartin,1995). These are basic to our 'power within' and Integrative power.

We notice that being empowered, autonomous or self-actualising, though come from diverse discourses, are overlapping and connected notions, if not equivalent. But surely these are desirable ways to be and live (however unreal they may seem today), thereby non-instrumental aims of education (although not beyond debate). Yet few important questions arise:

What power does education today have to empower? What is the role of power in pursuit of empowering/educating? How to exercise which power to empower people? How do power and education interact to empower people in which ways and how well?

We are so occupied in fairing well(competing, comparing) that many such questions pass unattended (Apple,1995). We often neglect some important issue like 'what is

⁵ Maslow expressed self-actualisation in terms of a state when 'inner requiredness' coincides with 'external requiredness', when the difference between "I want to" and "I must" diminishes. Rogers (as cited in McMartin,1995, p 162) sees self-actualisation motive as 'the urge to expand, extend, develop and mature'.

good'(normativity) and ' what might be'(possibilities), but just engage with 'what is'(fact).

Given the increasing inequality, levels of poverty and other crisis areas, society doesn't seem empowered. May be education has failed to contribute to creating a just and humane society, given the structures of domination and its legitimation. Therefore it is important to examine the relationship between education, economy, government and culture (Apple,1995).

It has been increasingly clear that education serves the dominant forces/ideologies and works towards "knowledge- economy". Economic decisions and market set values and direction for education. So" what is good for business is good for the country and its people" (Apple,1995, p xxvi), and that determines which and how knowledge will be selected, organised, taught and evaluated.

The credible goal of economic development (power now) can be gained by 'performativity', not by truth. Knowledge that helps perform is valued, produced, sold and bought, not as a value itself, but for the power it gets. The performativity and consumption of knowledge efficiently improves through technological tools which facilitate to quantify, store, miniaturise knowledge. The way learning and knowledge is acquired, classified and made available are fast changing. Neoliberalism has brought sponsorships, vouchers, privatisation to educational institutions. The alliance of education and employment situates education as well as students as both resources and instruments of development (Sharma,2012).

Lytard (Roberts, 1998) foresaw all this and that societies will have computerised knowledge and knowledge will be increasingly exteriorised, with its sale or exchange value, losing even its 'use value' and far from 'an end in itself'. Thinking and reflection are rendered useless. (Sharma, 2012)

The reforms in education are strategic interventions to promote modernisation, enhance viability of economic systems within world market and link macro issues of regulation with micro patterns of socialisation and child rearing (Popkewitz, 2000). Power is exercised through curricular and pedagogical regulations, like through techniques of accountability, measurement, management of education/schools.

All changes are guided by the idea of 'what is good' for us (Apple, 1995). 'Good schools' are dynamic, responsive to the clients' demands, and perform as per external judgments. (Apple,2003) Similarly, 'good teachers' are construed and shaped to meet what favours dominant value.

The strategies reinforce competition through mobility in and outside schools, along with economic insecurity and cultural indiscipline, by 'popularising' some new form of normalcy, a form of social-Darwinist thinking which then drives people to befit changes (Apple, 2003). Normalisation favours and justifies competition, standardisation, centralisation, national curricular goals for modernisation leading to marketization. Universalisation of reason is an inscription of power, appears natural and essential, but is constructed as phenomenon of normalisation and thus legitimises exclusion. Normativity expresses through rules of the normal and universal, silently (Popkewitz, 2000). All these phenomena are in tune with modernisation, progressivism, pragmatism and social constructivism.

The same phenomenon works to form new professional identities wherein competence means being productive, efficient, pragmatic, flexible and performative as wanted. People continuously respond to changes to meet the needs of state and

under constant surveillance as well as 'performance appraisal' public assessment to live up to mark, therefore are governed with hardly any criticism, reflection or alternatives. The enterprising and competitive individual is 'homo economicus', who is 'manipulable' in the 'marketized individualism' with tacit control (Apple, 2003).

Pedagogy as a tool and technology of power has implications for governing children, their subjectivities, also teachers' identity. Teacher is intervened in new ways to ensure work output and appraised in terms of being "efficient and productive" (Apple, 1995) shrinking the scope for self-regulation. In this system with governmentality people are treated as puppets with strings pulled by structural forces beyond their control and little understanding. They are totally formed out of 'discourses and hence having no real agency'.

Governmentality is strategic action which Foucault saw actually saw as "action on the action of others" and for this, it needs to be calculated, rationalised, shaping conduct and desires, and is oriented to certain ends. Education, being state issue is guided and governed through such strategies and techniques (Barnett etc. 2008). This raises the questions of ethics, freedom, autonomy, given the games and contests inherent in the strategic action.

Even if power is not against anything or domination (unintentional), through governing action, the subjectivity is being governed (Barnett etc. 2008), strategies play on people's choices and desires, affecting their motivations, beliefs and values, making individuals conform to norms and trends who then work and live without critical judgment. Rest is done by the force of socialisation, through everyday communication⁶, invisibly.

The governable person is constructed through governmentality. If educated person is conceived as self-governed, he/she cannot become easily governable/manipulable.

Comparing the scenario with classical liberalist terms of freedom, care and role of state and assumptions behind each, Apple analyses that individual was considered autonomous and wanting to pursue his interests best known to himself. State intervenes minimally allowing individuals their freedom and interests. The governance was to encourage self-governance.

But Apple (1995) perceives people as actors/agencies, individually and collectively, historically and currently. He holds that people can think critically through the tricky structural conditions as the strategies and techniques are not neutral and generate healthy and defensible alternatives.

Foucault (Stickney, 2007) talks of self-transformative potential and sees the infinite possibilities of subjectivisation as self-stylised and original despite similarly constituted selves. This is due to diverse ways in which subjects relate to rules because human subjects can develop 'a capacity for freedom and decision-making slowly, progressively, heteronomously and with different success. Freedom is a political skill or power to be exercised'.

Freedom is as possible in and from all relations, from everyone as power is. Power is relational, as in our ways of living, interacting, is multi-layered and everywhere, comes from everything and everyone. Power and freedom coexist, operate and transform. Depending on how subjects are capable of altering, transforming or reversing, rapid evolution is possible to form agency, self and reality (Wong, 2010).

⁶ Called 'lay normativity'

With multiple material causes, many transformative practices in education are commendable as shown in the book reviewed by Stickney.

Education in the modern world cannot go for either authority or tradition, yet must proceed in a way that is neither structured by authority nor held together by tradition. This requires autonomy, because political will and resources are deficient for creating such possibilities (said by Arendt, as cited in Pitt, 2010).

Pitt (2010) goes with Kant's views on education being imperative for the development of mankind. Education is justifiably taken as a means to nurture human freedom and creation of peaceful and orderly nation-state. She observes that the educational aim of developing rationality may be sufficient basis to make persons productive. But autonomy, understood as responsibility, as a worthwhile aim of education, demands much more than capacity to reason and produce. The 'mature enlightenment', idea by Kant, is interpreted as autonomy beyond reason, involving affective zones. Yet self-incurred immaturity has been a serious concern for both Kant and Freud.

Pitt considers that teacher- autonomy is crucial for developing student-autonomy. She studies how the achievement of maturity becomes elusive for new teachers when immaturity of individual meets immaturity of profession.

In developing maturity, which plays very significant role in teaching-learning situation (Benson, 2005), the way we relate to others and allow others to relate to us matters⁷.

In the way, 'individuals direct their actions and those of others', Foucault⁸ refers to the 'techniques of self' to govern ourselves that get better by⁹ being reflective and watchfully evaluative of self and direct us to what we deeply care about, making us moral/ethical agents and become more cohesive, satisfied, self-directed individuals with social responsiveness. For Foucault, being constructed and being autonomous are not mutually exclusive (Wong, 2010). Similarly, he sees autonomy as both instrumental and intrinsic.

It comes clearly that being watchful/aware and reflexive our concerns, values and how we relate to rules as well as self and others, our orientation are largely upto us and not so governed externally.

This can free us from dependence, helplessness, fear of social annihilation and lack of confidence, and increases new teachers' capacity to deal with frustration, complexity, challenges. It takes all- skill, understanding, will, interaction among social and cognitive aspects with affective. Stengel (2010) also reiterates that escaping from affect-inspired ambiguity and our quest for cognitive certainty keeps us from autonomy.

⁷ Friedman sees personal autonomy in three dimensions- normative (rooted in values, intentions), relational (rooted in social context/web) and larger liberal-political dimension

⁸ Foucault analyses governing actions as having two poles one where state directs actions of groups and individuals through both relation of power and disciplinary techniques; and the other with the individual.

⁹ Foucault, in his later works looked up history to find these and compared the three models - Christian, which stands on sacrifice and service, Platonic which demands transcendence, and Hellenistic that is about spiritual practice and requires watching and evaluating oneself. The last one he preferred most.

Pitt senses urgency about education being at a point where we have to decide whether we love the world enough to assume responsibility for it (just reminding of Boulding's 'integrative power'). When love of children, knowledge, and ability to know (authentically) become our reason to decide, choose, and act/practice in education, then autonomy seems natural. Our deep concerns (autonomous) play pervasively in all our choices and actions. When transformed, we live, see and work differently.

Kant sees humans living according to their nature, which is being rational, self-conscious, reflexive and therefore responsible. Hare places integrity of judgment as central to autonomy and contrasts it with socialisation. We make judgments and choose accordingly. Choices presuppose possibilities, options, alternatives and thus our agency. Any of cognition, rationality, moral rules is not enough because we decide in face of uncertainty also, through our judgment. Reflectivity and values help improve it (Scheffler, 1985).

In teaching situations, teacher agency is important and can develop better when both head and heart are trained, says Palmer (as cited in Liston, 2010). Clear understanding and courage with vision lead to inner wisdom and practical insight and unique response in any teaching situation, real challenges and dilemmas. Better role orientation and consciousness is needed than possible through teacher education or within system.

Creating non-political alternatives becomes not only important but necessary for autonomy of humans and education. Many shades of contemplative stance, such as self-reflection emerge now as a way to help develop power of attention, which is required for proper perception and motivation (Caranfa, 2010). This brings clear direction to learning and integrity to live learning. Self-knowledge, along with self-love and self-will become self-worth.

Mond's (2013) educational experiment justifies the need for quietening the mind which becomes noisy in the fast changing society and life where competition and instability are continuous in everyday experience that threaten, frighten and tire students who have to remain vigilant in the distrustful environment. This can make them violent also. They need to experience calmness and be able to share and care in respectful and trustful environment which activates their insightfulness, brings confidence that life can be otherwise than stressful and can direct their rational mind also better.

Believing strongly that empowerment is conscious self-inducement, it comes from within, and cannot be acquired, Taliaferro (1991) cautions teachers against the imposed 'teacher empowerment programs', which have hidden agendas to disempower/control.

She finds that great teachers feel powerful, rather than helpless, understand their work, are attentive, motivated, participative, engaged and responsible. They feel fulfilled beyond rewards and recognition, they empower students by creating a 'freedom niche' where teaching and learning are nurtured. These are all characteristics of autonomous and self-actualising persons.

But most teachers feel power only from outside, not from their own motivation, evaluation, but from evaluation and accountability mechanisms that can dissuade most from doing things for oneself (beyond acknowledgement and rewards, towards autonomy).

This, according to Krishnamurti (1953), who led a unique form of education in India, is due to the urge to conform, a desire for security rooted in fear which in turn invites power to dominate in some form, be it political, religious or social and further encourage subservience. Fear may take the form of respect and submission to the powerful often in forms of an individual, group or ideology and denies any intelligence to ourselves. We become mere 'cogs in the social machine' devoid of capacity to think creatively or attend wholly. Gradually we become indifferent, alienated, insensitive and increasingly dependent on external regulations. We passively hope for freedom while conforming, without caring to see which means can lead to what ends.

The problem with present day education, as he sees, is over-emphasises on technique which is destroying man (Krishnamurti, 1953). Cultivating capacity and efficiency without understanding life, without having a comprehensive perception of the ways of thought and desire can only make us increasingly ruthless and can bring many crises. Right education, Krishnamurti (2002) said, is for the transformation of individuals and society. It is total education for total life with total self. Learning, then, is by and for whole being, and involves free inquiry and exploration which comes to children naturally, they being curious. The inquiry is authentic and free from authority, external discipline, norms of obedience, conformity or dogma, or fear often generated by comparison and competition or for incentives. For this, teachers need to be open, growing, reflective, patient and loving themselves (empowered, autonomous)¹⁰. This total development occurs beyond mind's limitations, in which teaching is about the cultivating inquiring mind. Learning begins from self and is about knowing self also. That way, child is sensitive and responsive to totality without being self-centred. Solitude, study and dialogue also help to develop sensitivity and encourage an integrated whole perspective.

"Government control of education is a calamity" (Krishnamurti, 2002,p77). Government is training youth to be efficient. Regimentation and prejudice are being cultivated and enforced through mass instruction. Only education of individual can make individuality possible, and that is volitional.

Education, in its intrinsic sense is about empowerment or autonomy. And educational institutions run on certain ideologies and to ensure or promote their continuity through directives, regulatory mechanisms that can increasingly become subtle/invisible. Empowerment, at core is about inward direction, self-knowledge, self-love, self-worth being central . It is essentially an individual's volitional pursuit for one's own freedom and control in one's life. Neither can any system provide it, nor can nations in global race afford to educate to be persons who are integrated, free and self-governed, not so governable.

Analysing with reference to few meanings of education, whenever we want to make certain kind of persons (e.g., productive, efficient, good citizens), it is for certain purpose, to serve the powerful ideology, and therefore the valued aspects will be played in education. And whatever plays, stays. His/society's peace, harmony and well-being may not stand so relevant. Education, just an instrument for reproducing

¹⁰ Teacher has to be alive, responsive and open to whatever can help develop students' intelligence and encourage experiencing fully. Teaching is not a technique, a profession, but a way of life. An authentic teacher is not instrument of politicians, is not after power in any form (position, money, fame or honour). He just encourages students to exercise their intelligence freely and not be dependent on teacher, or see him as ideal.

power remains contested and choicelessly disempowered. If it is transforming due to forces outside of it, it loses power to transform. Education has to be empowered enough to empower; overpowered, it cannot empower.

But empowerment has as many original possibilities because freedom co-exists with power at multiple levels. Education can also be empowered as power of education lies in its normativity, and that too, in its intrinsic meaning. Engaging in reflection about 'what should education value' is necessary to regain its transformative potential, and by generating meaningful alternatives.

The human power to discern what is worthwhile, his will to develop perspectives need to be activated¹¹. Otherwise this 'power within' remains dormant and succumbs to the subtle play of external powers. Empowerment is about becoming free from oppression, outer control and conditioning (Rowlands). The choice depends on us: to live like puppets, driven, helpless, controlled and mechanically or move from automated mode to autonomous mode. Autonomy and freedom are always a choice with us and we better activate and develop it well. The concern is so central and pervasive to our life that it shows up in various forms and domains, as self-actualisation or empowerment, like a Hydra that if clipped, new hands emerge again¹².

Frankl (2008), a psychologist, who having survived through the experience of Nazi camp opines that even when everything is taken from man, one last human freedom lies in choosing ones attitude in any given set of circumstances. Man can avoid and not submit to those powers which threaten self, inner freedom and be free, dignified and protect us from apathy even in the most inhumane settings. The fundamental choice is not freedom from conditions, but it is freedom to take a stand towards conditions.¹³

¹¹ Among the criteria of education by Peters,

¹² Michael Hand , 2006, uses the expression while arguing against autonomy. Oxford Review of Education 32(4) pp 535-550.

¹³ As per behaviourism (Skinner as cited in Ozmon and Craver,1981)such 'power within', consciousness, 'inner realm' is denied whereby 'autonomy' and freedom become impossible concepts. Or at most, consciousness is a social product and not within the range of solitary individual, as it was verbalised that was considered conscious, rest was largely unconscious. People are controlled by forces they are unconscious of, no individuality can exist apart from social development (p223). Can we conceive of self not determined by any bit of biological inheritance and social environments. Many arguments against autonomy rise, that it has reference to oneself only; that education for autonomy seems self-contradictory, because no child can be left to his freedom without licence.

References

- Apple, M. W. (1995). *Education and power* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (2003). *Competition, knowledge and the loss of educational vision*. Philosophy of music education review: Indiana University Press. 3-22. Retrieved from http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/philosophy_of_music_education_review
- Barnett, C., Clarke, N., Cloke, P., Malpass, A. (2008). The elusive subject of neoliberalism: Beyond the analytics of governmentality. *Cultural Studies, Special Issue on 'Anti-Consumerism and Cultural Studies'*.
- Benson, P. (2005). [Review of book: *Autonomy, Gender, Politics*, by M. Friedman, 2003]. 214-217. publ by Hypatia
- Boulding, K.E. (1989). *Three Faces of Power*. California, Sage Publication.
- Caranfa, A. (2010). *Contemplative instruction and the gifts of beauty, love and silence*. Educational Theory, 60(5), 561-585.
- Carbone, M. (1990). *Why teacher empowerment now?* University of North Carolina Press. 98-102. Retrieved Jun 16, 2015 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40364669>.
- Carr, D. (2003). *Making sense of education: An introduction to the philosophy and theory of education and teaching*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Cooper, D. E. (1986). *Education, Values and Mind: Essays for R. S. Peters*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Doyale (Ed) Educational judgments: Papers in the philosophy of education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 119-142.
- Juceviciene, P. and J. Vizgirdaite (2012). Educational empowerment of collaborative learning at the university ; Kaunas, Lithuania. Socialiniai mokslai , No. 1 (75) . Retrieved from <http://www.wbdavisco.com/wp-content/uploads/spring2011.pdf>.
- Frankl, V. E. (2008). *Man's search for meaning: The classic tribute to hope from the holocaust*. London: Rider.
- Jodi, N. (2007). Interest and Purposes in Conceptions of Autinomy. *Paideus*, 16(1), 29-40.
- Kaufman, A.S. (1973). Comment on Frankena's 'The concept of education today' in Doyale (Ed) *Educational judgments: Papers in the philosophy of education* (pp 46-56). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Krishnamurti, J. (1953) *Education and the significance of life*. California: Krishnamurti Foundation of America.
- Krishnamurti, J. (2002). *Why are you being educated? Talks at Indian universities*. England: Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd.

Liston, D. P. (2010). *Contemplating teaching's conflicts and paradoxes*. Educational Theory. 60(1) 29-38.

Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

McMartin, J. (1995). *Personality psychology: A student-centered approach*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Mond, P (2013) *How Inner Quiet Becomes a Coping Skill*. The European Conference on Education, 2013. www.iafor.org

Moore, T. W. (1982). *Philosophy of education: An introduction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Ozmon, H. A. and Craver, S. M. (1981). *Philosophical foundations of education* (2nd ed). Columbus Ohio: Merrill Publication.

Peters, R. S. (1966). *Ethics and education*. Oxford: Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Peters, R. S. (1973). *Freedom and the development of the free man*. In book: F. J.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2000). *Educational knowledge: changing relationships between the state, civil society and educational community*. USA: State University of New York Press.

Pitt, A. (2010). *On having one's chance: Autonomy as education's limit*. Educational Theory. 60 (1) 1-18.

Pring, R. (1984). *Personal and social education in the curriculum*. Britain: British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data.

Roberts, P. (1998). Reading Lyotard: Knowledge, Commodification and Higher Education. *Electronic Journal of Sociology*; ICAAP.

Rowlands, J. (1995) *Empowerment examined : An exploration of the concept and practice of women's empowerment in Honduras.*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1424/>

Scheffler, I. (1985) *Of Human Potential: An Essay in the Philosophy of Education*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Sharma, N. (2012) *Situating the Educand: Knowledge, Knowing and Modernity*, Ph.D. thesis (unpublished), University of Delhi.

Skorupski, J. (2003). Ethics. In R. Curren (Ed.), *Blackwell companion to Philosophy of education*. Blackwell.

Stengel, B.S. (2010) *Autonomy? or responsibility?* Educational Theory, 60 (1), 1-2.

Stickney, J. (2007)[Review of the book *Michel Foucault: Materialism and Education* , 2006, by B. Olssen]. *Paideusis*,16(1), 73-78.

Susann, S. (1992). [Review of the book *The three faces of power* by K. E. Boulding, 1989] *International Journal on world peace*. 9 (3). 99-101. Retrieved from <http://jstor.org/stable/20751822>.

Taliaferro, M. B. (1991). *The myth of empowerment*. *Journal of Negro Education*, 60(1) 1-2. Retrieved 16th Jun 2015 from University of Delhi, from JSTOR

VeneKlasen, L. and Miller, V. (2002). *Power and empowerment*. *PLA Notes*, 43:39-41.

White, P. (1983). *Beyond domination: An essay in political philosophy of education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wong, J. (2010). Foucault and Autonomy. *Social Philosophy*, 96(3), 277-290. Published by Franz Steiner Verlag. Access: www.jstor.org/stable/23681693 ,30 sep 2015, UTC

NEETA ARORA
n26arora@gmail.com