

SECTION I

ZAKIR HUSAIN

CREATING ALTERNATIVE EDUCATIONAL

PARADIGMS

TALAT AZIZ¹

On the title page of the life-book of a teacher, what is written is not knowledge but the subject of love.

– ZAKIR HUSAIN

As with many other quotations, the above-mentioned words may sound clichéd unless we realise that Zakir Husain, civic nationalist, Gandhian, economist, President of India from 1967 to 1969, above all, a true lover of children, lived it. Take, for instance, a momentous event in Zakir Husain's life, described for us by one of his biographers, Rajmohan Gandhi:

One day in 1933 when Zakir Husain was distributing sweets to the boys who had passed a test in the primary school, a peon came and whispered to him that his three-year old daughter, Rehana... was very ill. Zakir Husain continued to give away the sweets. A little later the peon came again and told him in his ear that Rehana had died. Zakir Husain turned pale but did not stop what he was doing. Then the campus bell

1 Professor of Education at the Institute of Advanced Studies, Faculty of Education, Jamia Millia Islamia. The author wishes to thank Anil Sethi and Anupam Ahuja, both from NCERT for enriching the text and for eagle-eyed editing.

*was rung and everyone learnt that Dr. Zakir Husain's girl had died. Asked afterwards why he had not left the school at once, Zakir Husain replied that 'the children were feeling so happy, he did not like to interrupt it'. His wife told Mujeeb later that for several days after the event Zakir Husain's pillow was wet every morning.*²

It was this love of children and an unflinching interest in their well-being and happiness that led Zakir Husain to make the transition from Economics (a subject in which he had been formally trained) to Education to which he contributed ceaselessly. As Chair of a National Committee on *Nai Talim* or Basic Education (as it came to be called), Zakir Husain helped create this alternative Gandhian paradigm and played a significant role in devising its syllabi. Like many other nationalists, Zakir Husain was no mere ivory-tower intellectual but an indefatigable institution-builder. He presided over Jamia Millia Islamia and Aligarh Muslim University with distinction. As Vice-Chancellor of these institutions, he served as fund-raiser, accountant, secretary, editor and teacher – all rolled into one for many long years. In the universities too he attempted to implement the credo, 'learning by doing', and took a keen interest in their Education departments. The true educationalist in him did not allow for a distinction between school-education and the universities. Zakir Husain always viewed education as an organic whole.

THE EARLY YEARS

None other than his mother sowed the seeds of truthfulness, self-discipline and universal love for mankind in Zakir Husain's personality. She played a decisive role in his upbringing, especially after his father died in 1907, when Zakir Husain was only ten years old. In keeping with his family traditions, Zakir Husain's early education

2 Rajmohan Gandhi, *Understanding the Muslim Mind* (Delhi, Penguin, 2000), pp. 290-291.

in the Quran, Persian and Urdu was carried out at home. In 1907 he was admitted in Class V to the Islamia High School of Etawah, a residential institution founded by Maulvi Bashiruddin.

During his primary education Zakir Husain was under the care and guidance of Syed Altaf Husain, the Headmaster of the school, a rare teacher of great virtues, disciplinarian, and strict follower of his own principles. His influence on Zakir Husain was reflected in a paper 'Talib-e-ilm ki Zindagi' (Life of a Student) that the latter presented in the school assembly when he was just thirteen years old. In his presentation, Zakir Husain described the duties of a student, as "... He [that is, a student] should propagate education among his illiterate brothers and should consider the propagation of education as a part of his own education.... He ought to acquire education for the sake of education... If not educated, he is not a man at all, he cannot do anything worthwhile in this world." To drive home, his central point Zakir Husain used Persian verses – 'set your goals high, as by that you are rated, not only by the creator, but by those also who are created.' This shows that at the age of thirteen Zakir Husain had a clear understanding of what is education and what it can do to a person. Zakir Husain continued his studies at the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh from where he took an M.A. in Economics in 1920. He was appointed a Lecturer in the same year.

All through this period Zakir Husain also had a spiritual guide, Shaikh Hasan Shah, a *sufi* of the Chishti Silsila. Hasan Shah had a lasting impact on his disciple. He taught him to cultivate patience and diligence and a life-long love for books.

A DEVELOPING EDUCATIONIST — SOME KEY MILESTONES

1920 was a crucial year for Zakir Husain, a sort of turning point in his life. This was the year when the Indian National Congress and the All India Khilafat Committee joined hands in launching the Non-Cooperation Movement and

Gandhiji was touring the country to persuade teachers and students to leave government-administered schools and colleges. Zakir Husain who had a good grip over national and international affairs was keen on understanding Gandhiji's perspective. He attended one of his talks wherein Gandhiji urged fellow-countrymen to boycott the British system of education and join the Non-Cooperation Movement. He and his friends persuaded Maulana Mohammad Ali and Gandhiji to address the Aligarh students. Though the meeting was not successful, Zakir Husain resigned from the post of lecturer and met Hakim Ajmal Khan, Dr. M.A. Ansari, and Maulana Mohammad Ali in Delhi. They proposed to set up a National Centre of Education for Indian Youth. Thus, Zakir Husain became a pioneer of a new venture and Jamia Millia Islamia came into existence on 29th October 1920. In 1921 Zakir Husain was appointed as a Lecturer in Economics at the Jamia.

THE GERMAN INFLUENCE

Another milestone in becoming an educationist was Zakir Husain's doctoral studies in Berlin. He had been persuaded by his close friend Khwaja Abdul Hameed to choose Germany for this purpose. It was in Berlin that he first met Abid Husain and Mohammad Mujeeb, who were studying in Oxford and came to Berlin in September 1923 to work in a printing press. The three formed a troika and worked together for the next twenty-six years. Abid Husain was writing his thesis on the educational ideas of Herbert Spenser, which he submitted in 1925.

The three years spent in Berlin nurtured the teacher and educationist in Zakir Husain. Though his special subject was British agrarian policies in India and Agricultural Economics, he was more interested in literature and education. In particular, he attended Professor Edward Spranger's lectures and read his books. Professor Spranger was an outstanding figure in the field of Educational and Cultural Philosophy. During his stay

in Germany he also cultivated a refined taste in music and theatre.

Zakir Husain was deeply influenced by German thought, particularly, by George Kerschensteiner's revolutionary principles in Education. Kerschensteiner was critical of bookish schools and had in fact founded a 'Work-School'. He advocated that Head, Heart and Hand, should contribute to the process of education, and education in turn should train all these. Kerschensteiner believed that 'an educated person never considers himself complete... to strive naturally for education is a true indicator of a true education'. During his stay in Berlin Zakir Husain travelled to many places in Germany and visited important schools where various educational theories and methods of teaching were being practised. He also gave lectures on the philosophy of Gandhiji for whom he had great respect.

CONTRIBUTION TO A GROWING INSTITUTION

Zakir Husain's far-reaching academic commitments, going well beyond Agricultural Economics, helped him broaden his vision and develop a firm grasp of Education. He co-authored with Alfred Ehrenreich a book in German on Gandhiji, translated Plato's *Republic* into Urdu, imbibing Plato's reasoning and thoughts during the translation. He fully believed in and practised Plato's view that only proper education frees one from mental slavery and helps in the manifestation of creative abilities. This is the only way innovativeness and imagination can be nurtured, knowledge, wisdom and civilisations advanced. His interest in education and the Jamia Millia were inextricably interwoven, compelling him to accept an invitation to return to the Jamia when the chance came his way.

Hakim Ajmal Khan and M. A. Ansari visited Zakir Sahib in Vienna in 1925. Hakim Sahib persuaded him to return to Jamia after completing his education. He fulfilled his promise in February 1926, inspiring his friends Abid Husain and Mohammad Mujeeb to work with him at the Jamia. A journey for an educationist as well as an

institution thus began from Qarol Bagh (Karol Bagh) where Jamia was shifted from Aligarh. Zakir Husain joined Jamia as its Vice-Chancellor or *Shaikhul Jamia* at the young age of twenty-nine.

In 1926 Zakir Husain went to Sabarmati Ashram to discuss education and the Jamia with Gandhiji. He returned from there with a renewed zeal. Gandhiji too was satisfied about the future of Jamia being in the hands of a confident and secular Zakir. Gandhiji's support for Jamia was an asset and later he sent his grandson Rasiklal to Jamia for his education.

If any single educational principle guided Zakir Husain in Jamia for nearly twenty-three years, it was 'learning by doing'. His concept of 'doing' was to a large extent spiritual also. He did not advise, preach or guide his fellow-workers but drove them to examine their own will power and further build upon their intelligence and sensitivity. He made Jamia a 'School of Work' where one found only a minimum use of books and many practical activities with educational values. He considered a true 'work-school' to be a place where children acquire the habit of planning, of considering ways or means thoroughly before they start work and examine their achievements critically when they have done what they set out to do. He introduced the Project Method of learning in schools, as he considered it appropriate for the mental and social development of children.

An important feature of the Jamia schools was that they encouraged teachers to practise the constructivist approach, something that the NCERT's present-day National Curriculum Framework advocates. Zakir Husain himself taught at primary, secondary and higher classes in Jamia. Being an economist he introduced the concept of banking through a 'children's bank', 'children's book-shop' and the like at Jamia's primary school where students in residential hostels needed to manage their own money. The school also maintained a small zoo and farm, which were looked after by children under the supervision of teachers. Zakir Husain considered childhood as the most

important period of life for the development of personality. He observed that children's nature compels them every moment of their waking life to experiment, to break and make things. So at the initial stage all children can be educated through similar practical activities.

For Zakir Husain the purpose of education was three fold – to develop students' faculties, to transmit to them their cultural heritage and to awaken in them an inner self. The best way for children to develop their mental faculties is to let them think through their hands, to acquire knowledge about things through practical use. Therefore it is essential that practical work be made the instrument and focus of all mental training and education. Manual work proves to be more effective than books in promoting mental development. For Zakir Husain education was also the transmission of spiritual and cultural values of a nation to its younger generation in such a way as to make it an integral part of their life. For this, the educator has first to realise these values in herself and then to transmit them to her pupils. Furthermore, he regarded national integration as an essential objective of education and urged Indian educationalists to discover effective means for its attainment.

In 1937 India attained a measure of provincial autonomy and Gandhiji attempted to persuade the new popular governments of various provinces to adopt *nai talim* or Basic Education as a national system of education. Zakir Husain agreed with the spirit of Gandhiji's 'Basic Education' but was not satisfied with the mode. At a conference on the subject held at Wardha, he disagreed on several counts with Gandhiji. Aware of Zakir Husain's potential, Gandhiji gave him the responsibility of framing the curriculum for Basic Education in schools and asked him to do so within a month. Not only did he accomplish this successfully, he also undertook to train teachers. Thus a new department, 'Ustadon-ka-Madrasa' (Teachers' College) was started. As is evident from the Patel Memorial Lecture, delivered by Zakir Husain many years later, he

believed that teachers be trained 'in the technique of such competent observations as will enable them to understand their pupils and direct their educational work in the light of this understanding.'

SERVING A NATIONAL CALL

Zakir Husain remained associated, after Independence, with education as with the Jamia and Aligarh. The partition of the country had led to the migration of a sizable section of the Muslim elite to Pakistan. In the circumstances, Nehru and Maulana Azad persuaded Zakir Husain to accept the Vice-Chancellorship of Aligarh Muslim University and provide academic stability to the institution in the larger interests of the nation. Zakir Husain served in that capacity for nine years until he became the Governor of Bihar. At heart, though, he remained a teacher throughout his life and displayed keen interest in academic work.

As Vice-President as well as President of India he spoke on a variety of themes including his favourite subjects of education and culture, science education, and sports in schools. He also shared thoughts on Gandhiji, special-needs education, the responsibilities and qualities of good teachers, education and the status of women, and the social responsibilities of the people of India, apart from addressing many other matters related to national and world affairs.

On the occasion of Teacher's Day (5 September) 1964, he communicated a message emphasising that 'the teachers are responsible not just for themselves but also for the whole society. A teacher is the custodian of the highest values created and cherished by his people. Teachers have a mission and consciousness that they are engaged in the most significant task of building a free people.... You will have to transform mercenary labour into dedicated service. You will have to rise above the suffocating dust of uniformed partisanship into the purer region of impartial objectivity'. He urged them not to force children into silently brooding over books, unwillingly

swallowing inassimilable information. He wanted them to be up and about, discovering things for themselves, not being condemned for their bursting energy.

Zakir Husain breathed his last on 3 May 1969. In her condolence message Indira Gandhi described Zakir Husain as 'an unforgettable teacher, a builder and a writer of distinction.' He chose the field of education because of his great faith in the power of education to mould the individual and society. He took pride in calling himself a teacher, believing that only through education would the people gain a vision of the future while preserving their old timeless values.

Today we see a renewed interest in reinventing our education system as also in education as a vehicle of social change. In perceiving the child as a discoverer and constructor of knowledge for herself, the National Curriculum Framework-2005 offers us a step in the right direction. Achieving this lofty objective will indeed be a true homage to Zakir Husain, a great teacher and educationist, a humanist par excellence.

SECTION II

RIGHT TO EDUCATION AND BANNING CORPORAL PUNISHMENT ONCE AND FOR ALL

PROFESSOR SHANTHA SINHA

Corporal Punishment in schools and other institutions including the family is widely accepted socially and regarded as legitimate. There is shock and outrage only when there is a serious violence against a child in an institutional setting, but routine physical abuse and emotional harassment causing injury, hurt and humiliation is accepted as normal. Similar acts are likely to be considered as criminal offence if it were aimed at an adult but tend to be ignored when it is aimed at a child.

The liberty to treat children with such authority by the adults comes from the understanding that children are less than adults and that the adults have a duty as well as a responsibility to control and discipline children. Therefore in the best interest of children adults can use force and violence to correct them. Thus the act of violence and exercise of power of the adult over the child is repeatedly justified. It is seldom regarded that children are individuals in their own right and equal to adults. What distinguishes children from adults is that their capacities are evolving and so would require greater care and protection. It is in the ambience of non-violence and respect that they fully develop to become confident individuals in their own right.

Research shows that corporal punishment contributes to children dropping out of school. More generally, fear

of being punished makes children less willing and able to ask questions or challenge what they are taught, and so detracts from the quality of education. What is required therefore is to build skills of school teachers, care givers and adults at large to engage with children as equals, listen to them and address their concerns in a manner that does not hurt or humiliate them. The RTE Act bans all forms of physical and emotional harassment of children thus giving an opportunity to all schools and institutions to establish a culture of respecting children and non-violence.

1. BACKGROUND

In the last couple of months alone, there have been numerous news items of acts of violence on children by school teachers. In Mahboobnagar (Andhra Pradesh), a village school teacher brandished six year old boys and girls with firewood for not standing in a line for mid day meals. A teacher in Jhunjhun, Rajasthan beat up an eight year girl so badly for not doing her homework that she lost her eye. A Class IV student of a private school in Bangalore had his front teeth partially broken when the Class teacher hurled a wooden duster at him for smiling in the class. A Class II student in a government school in Delhi died of heat stroke after she was made to squat in the sun with bricks on her back. Two Class III children of a private school in Kadapa, Andhra Pradesh found speaking in Telugu were forced to wear a slate around their neck, declaring 'I will never speak in Telugu'. A Class VII student of a private school in Mumbai, were made to sit outside the principal's office on the floor facing a toilet for over six hours, for two successive days because her hands had *mehendi* designs that she and her friends had done for Id. A Class VI student in Guwahati, was tortured to death by two teachers for not completing his homework.

These gross acts have come to light through newspapers. But all of us know that most children are subjected to violence such as slapping, caning, kneeling down, standing up on

bench, making rounds in the school compound and many such 'routine' acts in the name of discipline. If the child is poor, from a scheduled caste community, or a girl she is likely to face such 'routine' acts more often.

Undoubtedly, insults, humiliation and acts of violence, both emotional and physical have an impact on children and their levels of confidence and self-esteem and militate against the freedom and dignity of a child. In addition, physical assault can incapacitate health of children harming their growth and well being. Research shows that corporal punishment contributes to children dropping out of school jeopardising their right to education. More generally, fear of being punished makes children less willing and able to ask questions or challenge what they are taught, and so detracts from the quality of education.

One can very well imagine how, when subject to insult and humiliation, they would react and what must be happening in their minds. Some have been able to brave the insults and pursue education regardless of violence. At the same time there are innumerable incidents where children have become martyrs to corporal punishment. Some have even committed suicide. In Kolkata, a Class VIII boy was caned and punished repeatedly and he committed suicide. In Uttar Pradesh, a girl of Class VIII who was also from the scheduled caste community was punished and asked to clean latrines. Unable to bear the insult and caste discrimination she too committed suicide. The Commission has heard innumerable cases of suicide of children for being subject to insinuating and often unreasonable remarks by school teachers. In that year, 2008 it was reported that there were 98 suicides of children in Tamil Nadu alone as a consequence of corporal punishment.

Based on the experiences of 12,447 children aged 5-18 years in 13 states and 2,449 stakeholders (adults holding positions in government departments, schools, private service and urban and rural local bodies, as well as individuals from the community), the study conducted by Ministry of Women and Child Development revealed a

high prevalence of corporal punishment in all settings— family homes, schools, institutions and on the streets. Two out of three schoolchildren were found to be victims of corporal punishment, that is, an overwhelming majority of children (65.01 per cent) reported being beaten in school. Of these, 54.28 per cent were boys and 45.72 per cent were girls. The study also indicated that an alarmingly high percentage of children in state-run schools (53.8 per cent) faced corporal punishment, followed by public schools (22.3 per cent). NGO-run schools accounted for 13 per cent cases.

The most commonly reported punishment was being slapped or kicked (63.67 per cent), followed by being beaten with a stick (31.31 per cent), and being pushed or shaken (5.02 per cent). Such punishment sometimes left visible marks, as in physical injury, swelling or bleeding. However, little gets known of the mental anguish a child goes through unless it manifests in a suicide or death. When stakeholders were asked for their views on physical or corporal punishment, over 44.54 per cent felt it was necessary in disciplining children, 25.45 per cent disagreed and 30.01 per cent expressed no opinion¹.

2. CORPORAL PUNISHMENT — SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE

Corporal punishment is not an isolated instance but is a manifestation of a culture of violence and insensitivity to children and their rights. They go unnoticed as it has a general social acceptance. Many of those in authority at all levels have been to school and have had some experience, either directly or indirectly of corporal punishment. Since

-
1. Kacker, L., Varadan, S. and Kumar, P. (2007), *Study on Child Abuse: India 2007*, New Delhi: Ministry of Women and Child Development). Also see (Devi Prasad, B. (2006), *Spare the Rod and Save the Child: A Study of the Corporal punishment in urban schools of Andhra Pradesh*, Child Rights Advocacy Foundation-Vijayawada), (Saath Charitable Trust/Plan International, India (2006), *Impact of Corporal Punishment on School Children: A Research Study – Final Report* and <http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/pages/progress/reports/india.html>

they have not become school dropouts nor have scars of humiliation and insults or have amnesia and do not recall their childhood in schools some of them feel that there is unnecessary fuss about corporal punishment. In fact, they would even attribute their success to the fact that they were disciplined by the parents and school teachers and so find nothing wrong in being punished, especially if done in good faith and with good intentions. They are unmindful and oblivious to the harrowing experiences of violence and insults that other children have faced and thus would not even acknowledge that corporal punishment is a serious issue requiring action.

Embedded in this atmosphere of condoning violence on children, parents too believe that punishment of children is indispensable and often use similar methods to discipline children. When they come to know that their children are not being treated well in school, they do not bring it up with the school teacher and the school authorities as it is considered normal to be punished. At times they understand that the child needs a hearing from the school teacher and the school authorities but are unable to dialogue with the teacher out of fear that the child would be further victimised. Since a child spends at least six hours a day in school, perhaps more time in the school than at home, parents feel vulnerable and chose to remain silent.

As professionals, school teachers are equipped to see the futility of common sense that corporal punishment is a pedagogic tool for disciplining children. They are fully aware that fear stifles the process of learning and that it is wrong to hit or insult children. They have been given skills to engage with children in a creative manner, while appreciating that each child is unique and has her own pace and style of acquiring knowledge. Yet, why is it that they flout professional ethics and perpetrate violence on children. It is the indifference of the education system as a whole that includes the school teachers, principals, management and the education bureaucracy, which is unwilling to transcend the pervasive atmosphere that

regards children as less than equals and does not see punishment as a violation of human right.

Children just do not like being insulted and beaten up. In their wisdom they have decided that the world of adults would not understand and can do little to help them out of such humiliation. Therefore, they remain silent due to fear and submit to violence without questioning. They are deeply hurt and unless it becomes unbearable, they do not tell. They sometimes show signals of deep hurt in their behaviour but this goes unnoticed, perpetuating further violence on them. They are so much part of values and norms that our society especially we as adults have created that they feel this is what growing up is all about and there is no point complaining. Even when they do, it is likely that they are not heard and the incidence of physical or emotional hurt is trivialised.

3. DEFINITION OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

It is not easy to define corporal punishment as it involves humiliation and insult which a child feels as a subject. Whilst, the subjective feeling of the child and the multitudinous and ingenious forms of inflicting physical pain constitutes corporal punishment, considering the millions of ways in which such violence is perpetrated on children in contemporary times, it is impossible to exhaust all the forms of insinuations and violence. Therefore one could only indicate what corporal punishment would constitute and not hazard a definition. Currently, there is no statutory definition of corporal punishment of children in Indian law.

The UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) defines corporal punishment as follows:

“The Committee defines “corporal” or “physical” punishment as any punishment in which physical force is used and intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort, **however light**. Most involves hitting (“smacking”, “slapping”, “spanking”) children, with the hand or with an implement — a whip, stick, belt, shoe, wooden spoon, etc. But it

can also involve, for example, kicking, shaking or throwing children, scratching, pinching, biting, pulling hair or boxing ears, forcing children to stay in uncomfortable positions, burning, scalding or forced ingestion (for example, washing children's mouths out with soap or forcing them to swallow hot spices). **In the view of the Committee, corporal punishment is invariably degrading.** In addition, there are other non-physical forms of punishment that are also cruel and degrading and thus incompatible with the Convention. These include, for example, punishment which belittles, humiliates, denigrates, scapegoats, threatens, scares or ridicules the child.² [Emphasis added]"

The Committee also notes that corporal punishment can be inflicted in many contexts:

"12. Corporal punishment and other cruel or degrading forms of punishment of children take place in many settings, including within the home and family, in all forms of alternative care, schools and other educational institutions and justice systems - both as a sentence of the courts and as a punishment within penal and other institutions - in situations of child labour, and in the community."

The definition above is a useful benchmark because it emphasises the various physical forms that corporal punishment might take, and establishes that this full spectrum of physical punishment — even acts that many consider "mild" - constitutes corporal punishment — there isn't a threshold below which physical force against a child is acceptable.

The National Commission for Protection of Child Rights in its guidelines on corporal punishment does not make a

2. Committee on the Rights of the Child, General Comment No. 8, The right of the child to protection from corporal punishment and other cruel or degrading forms of punishment (arts. 19; 28, para. 2; and 37, inter alia) (Forty-second session, 2006), U.N. Doc. CRC/C/GC/8 (2006).

distinction between forms of violence. It considers that, 'all forms of corporal punishment are a fundamental breach of human rights. A slap is as detrimental to the child's right as grievous injury. Indeed there are no gradations since it must be seen that condoning so called 'small acts' actually lead to gross violations.'³

4. PROVISIONS THAT CAN BE USED TO PROSECUTE CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

In theory, corporal punishment is covered by all the provisions under Indian law that punish perpetrators of physical harm. Article 21 of the Constitution protects the right to life, which has been interpreted to include the right to education for children under 14, and the right to dignity⁴. Article 14 of the Constitution guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. Although Article 15(3) of the Constitution allows the State to make special provisions for children and protect them as a class from physical abuse to which they are particularly vulnerable this has seldom caught the attention of policy makers. However in practice we have seen that while abuse directed against an adult would be criminally prosecuted as it violates Article 14 or Article 21, a similar abuse against children is tolerated.

The Directive Principles of State Policy are not justiciable rights, yet, several of the provisions are indicative of the value that the Constitution makers placed for protection of children. Article 39 (e) directs the State to work progressively to ensure that "the tender age of children are not abused". Article 39(f) directs the State to work progressively to ensure that "children are given opportunities and facilities to develop in a healthy manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity and that childhood and youth are protected against exploitation and against moral and material abandonment." Article 41

3. http://www.ncpcr.gov.in/Guidelines/Guidelines_on_Corporal_Punishment_to_Chief_Secretaries.pdf

4. *Unnikrishnan v State of Andhra Pradesh* (1993) 1 SCC 645 ; *M.C. Mehta v State of Tamil Nadu and Ors* (1996) 6 SCC 756

requires the State to “make effective provision for” inter alia, securing the right to education. Article 45 enjoins the State to provide early childhood care and education to children up to age six. Article 51 A: made it the fundamental duty of a parent or guardian to provide educational opportunities to her child or ward between the ages of six and fourteen⁵.

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act 2000⁶ is the only statute that criminalises acts that may cause a child mental or physical suffering.

Section 23 of the JJA 2000 states as follows:

Whoever, having the actual charge of, or control over, a juvenile or the child, assaults, abandons, exposes or wilfully neglects the juvenile or causes or procures him to be assaulted, abandoned, exposed or neglected in a manner likely to cause such juvenile or the child unnecessary mental or physical suffering shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months, or fine, or with both.

Section 23 covers the actions of anyone who has “actual charge or control over” a child. While Section 23 is likely to be applied most often to personnel in childcare institutions regulated by the JJA, it arguably applies to cruelty by anyone in a position of authority over a child, which would include parents, guardians, teachers and employers. Section 23 thus has the potential to be used to prosecute corporal punishment in a range of contexts. Although it does not use the words “corporal punishment”, it is framed so as to cover the range of actions that constitute corporal punishment. It is also important to note that Section 23 is punishable with a maximum of six months imprisonment. In practice, there is no evidence of the implementation of this provision.

The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 provides that no child shall be subject

5. Constitution of India, Article 51A(k)

6. Amended in 2006

to “physical punishment or mental harassment” in schools⁷. Those officials that contravene this provision shall be liable for disciplinary action under service rules applicable to them.

This prohibition is an important step forward – it reinforces and enshrines in law the growing consensus against corporal punishment in schools. However, the provision does not *criminalise* corporal punishment; it does not resolve contradictory provisions in criminal law in favour of an absolute ban. Nor does it lay down a standardised penalty for corporal punishment that should be incorporated in service rules to punish corporal punishment. In practice, this could mean corporal punishment is penalised very lightly, which would have little deterrent effects given how widely it is accepted as a method of discipline.

The criminal law that protects adults from all kinds of assaults and violence are equally applicable to assaults on children. While these provisions make no distinction between adults and children, in practice, corporal punishment in schools and other institutions tends not to be prosecuted because it is widely socially accepted and regarded as legitimate. Authorities are likely to take action against very serious violence against a child in an institutional setting but routine physical abuse which is likely to be prosecuted if it were aimed at an adult tends to be accepted and ignored when it is aimed at a child. Several provisions of the Indian Penal Code relating to varying degrees of physical harm and intimidation can be used to prosecute corporal punishment against children in an institutional setting, but rarely are.⁸ Some provisions of

7. Clause 17

8. These include, inter alia: IPC Section 305: Abetment of suicide committed by a child; Section 323: Voluntarily causing hurt; Section 325: Voluntarily causing grievous hurt; Section 326: Voluntarily causing hurt by dangerous weapons or means; Section 352: Assault or use of criminal force otherwise than a grave provocation; Section 354: Outraging the modesty of a woman; Section 506: Criminal intimidation; Section 509: Word, gesture or act intended to insult the modesty of a woman

the Scheduled Castes and Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 can be used to prosecute corporal punishment by an adult who does not belong to a scheduled caste or scheduled tribe against children who do fall under either of these categories⁹.

The Global Initiative to End Corporal Punishment¹⁰ recommends that respecting a legal ban on corporal punishment should become a contractual condition, so that teachers and others who continue to use corporal punishment risk losing their jobs. In cases in which teachers and others, after warning, continue to use corporal punishment, prosecution should be incorporated as a legitimate and necessary response.

5. CASE LAW ON CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

In recent years, the courts have taken a stand against corporal punishment in a few instances. In Delhi, the High Court took the initiative on corporal punishment in 2000, and struck down Rule 37 of the Delhi School Education Rules, 1973¹¹ which allowed physical punishment of school children by a school principal. The High Court stated unequivocally that corporal punishment violated the child's Constitutional rights to equality under the law and right to life, was in conflict with India's obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child and contrary to the National Policy on Education¹². In 2004, the Calcutta High Court ruled that caning was unlawful in government schools in West Bengal¹³.

9. These include: Section 3(1)(i): forcing a member of a Scheduled Caste or Scheduled Tribe to eat any inedible or obnoxious substance; Section 3(1)(iii): Forcible removal of clothes and parade naked or any similar act which is derogatory to human dignity; Section 3(1)(x): Intentional insult or intimidation with the intent to humiliate; Section 3(1)(xi): assault or use of force against a woman with intent to dishonour or outrage her modesty.

10. <http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/>

11. Rules 37(1)(a)(ii) and (4)

12. *Parents Forum for Meaningful Education and another vs. Union of India and another*, AIR 2001 Delhi 212

13. <http://www.corpun.com/ins00402.htm>

In 2008, the High Court of Gujarat granted in part an appeal by a teacher convicted of abetting suicide of and causing injury to a student he had allegedly hit, kicked and abused verbally, who committed suicide soon afterwards¹⁴. The Court's decision was based on its evaluation of the evidence before it. However, in its deliberations, the High Court distanced itself from arguments that the appellant was protected by Sections 88 and 89 of the IPC, and rejected completely the argument that parents or guardians give implied consent to school authorities physically or mentally harming a child as a method of discipline. The Gujarat High Court pronounced this argument archaic, and disagreed with judgments from the 1940s by the High Courts of Bombay and Madras that took this view.

Both section 88 and 89 of Indian Penal Code (I.P.C.) have in the earlier judgments been used in defence of the offender. To elaborate Section 88 of the I.P.C. is in respect of an act not intended to cause death, done by consent in good faith for benefit of a child below 12 years of age while Section 89 of the I.P.C. speaks of an act done in good faith for benefit of child or insane person, by or by consent of guardian. The principle which is advanced is this. That when child is sent to school, the guardian consents to reasonable corporal punishment to the child. The Gujarat Court's decision stated that 'corporal punishment to child, in present days, with principle as advanced, is not recognised by law. It is an archaic notion that to maintain discipline, child can be punished physically by the teaching staff because of implied consent by the parents or guardian'. Further in its judgment it declared that, 'Child has human rights. Now it is recognised social principle that even parents of the child are made to understand the basic human rights of the child and instead of corporal punishment, correctional methods are recognised in law. Apart from mere indiscipline in school, by virtue of Juvenile

14. *Hasmukhbhai Gokaldas Shah vs. State of Gujarat*, 17 November 2008, Criminal Appeal No. 798 of 1996,

Justice Act, if the child under the age of 18 commits any crime, and even it is convicted, the child or juvenile cannot be subjected to any sentence and, therefore, accepting the principle as has been advanced by the appellant's Counsel would be to put clock back years previous'¹⁵.

This jurisprudence is encouraging, but it can only offer partial and incomplete legal protection to children as long as defences to corporal punishment are not overruled or amended.

6. INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS TO END CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

India signed the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child includes the Right to Protection 1988 ("CRC") in 1992. It is bound by its obligations under the CRC to ensure that "no child shall be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment"(Article 37(a)) and this is complemented and extended by Article 19, which requires States to "take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse, while in the care of parent(s), legal guardian(s) or any other person who has the care of the child".

Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention refers to school discipline and requires States parties to "take all appropriate measures to ensure that school discipline is administered in a manner consistent with the child's human dignity and in conformity with the present Convention".

Under the CRC, India has a clear, immediate, binding obligation to ban all legalised violence against children.

15. Criminal Appeal No. 798 of 1996 ,Decided On: 17 November 2008, in the High Court of Gujarat at Ahmedabad, Criminal Appeal No. 798 of 1996, Decided On: 17 November 2008, MANU/GJ/0757/2008

India has been party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) since 1979. Article 7 of the ICCPR provides that no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Therefore, India is bound to protect children from to the same extent as it protects adults.

Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966 (ICESCR) enshrines the right of everyone to education, and also provides that education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity, and shall strengthen the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. India has been party to the ICESCR since 1979, and is bound by the obligation to respect, protect and promote Article 13. Clearly, endemic, legally sanctioned corporal punishment is incompatible with this vision of a child's right to education.

The Committee on the Rights of the Child – the treaty monitoring body for the CRC – has interpreted the Convention as prohibiting all corporal punishment, whether in the public sphere or within the family. The General Comments of the Committee on the Rights of the Child are “soft law”, i.e. are not legally binding, but have strong persuasive value, and should guide how the domestic law is interpreted and applied.

In 2001, the Committee adopted a general comment on “The Aims of Education”, and emphasised that corporal punishment is incompatible with the Convention.

“... Children do not lose their human rights by virtue of passing through the school gates. Thus, for example, education must be provided in a way that respects the inherent dignity of the child, enables the child to express his or her views freely in accordance with article 12, paragraph 1, and to participate in school life. Education must also be provided in a way that respects the strict limits on discipline reflected in article 28, paragraph 2, and promotes non-violence in school.”

In 2006, the Committee adopted General Comment 8, specifically on the right of the child to protection from corporal punishment. In General Comment 8, the Committee made clear that the CRC is unambiguous – it does not allow any form of legalised violence against children and that eliminating corporal punishment “is an immediate and unqualified obligation of States parties”¹⁶.

The Committee also rejects entirely the defence of “reasonable” or “moderate” punishment “for the benefit of the child” **that prevails in many legal systems. In response to such defences, the Committee states:**

“Interpretation of a child’s best interests must be consistent with the whole Convention, including the obligation to protect children from all forms of violence and the requirement to give due weight to the child’s views; it cannot be used to justify practices, including corporal punishment and other forms of cruel or degrading punishment, which conflict with the child’s human dignity and right to physical integrity.”¹⁷

It highlights that, given how ubiquitous corporal punishment is, many States have realised the need for explicit prohibition rather than simply repealing defences or justifications for corporal punishment.

Other UN treaty bodies, including the Human Rights Committee, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Committee against Torture have reflected the same view in their concluding observations on States parties’ reports under the relevant instruments, recommending prohibition and other measures against corporal punishment in schools, penal systems and, in some cases, the family.

In December 2005, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution on the rights of the child which called for the elimination of all school corporal punishment and corporal punishment of children in detention¹⁸.

16. GC, paragraph 22

17. [1] A/RES/60/231, 23 December 2006

18. A/RES/60/231, 23 December 2006

The UN Child Rights Committee has, in its response to reports by States, consistently highlighted the need to prohibit corporal punishment. In 2000, the Committee recommended that India “take legislative measures to prohibit all forms of physical and mental violence, including corporal punishment and sexual abuse of children in the family, schools and care institutions.”¹⁹ In 2004, the Committee noted the Delhi High Court’s decision on corporal punishment, but expressed concern that corporal punishment remained legally permissible, and strongly recommended that India prohibit corporal punishment in the family, in schools and other institutions²⁰.

7. POLICY FRAMEWORK

At the level of policy, there is growing momentum against corporal punishment. State Governments have issued directives or announced policy banning corporal punishment in several states, including, inter alia, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh²¹. The National Policy on Education is categorically against corporal punishment and calls for its eradication from schools²². The National Charter for Children 2003 provides that “the State shall ensure that school discipline and matters related thereto do not result in physical, mental, psychological harm or trauma to the child”²³. One of the core objectives of the National Plan of Action for Children 2005 is “to protect all children against...injury,...sexual and physical abuse of all kinds,... corporal punishment, torture, exploitation, violence, and

19. Child Rights Committee, Concluding observations on initial report 23 February 2000, CRC/C/15/Add.115, , paras. 38, 40, 44 and 45

20. Child Right Committee, Concluding observations on second report, 26 February 2004, CRC/C/15/Add.228, paras. 44 and 45

21. *Status of Prohibition*, National Commission for the Protection of Child Rights, February 2009, http://www.ncpcr.gov.in/Reports/Status_of_Prohibition_SN_16_Feb_09.pdf

22. NPE 1986 (modified 1992), Section 5.2

23. NPA 2005, Article 7(f)

degrading treatment”²⁴. The Ministry of Human Resource Development has recently written to State Governments to abolish the practice of corporal punishment in all educational institutions²⁵. Idukki district in Kerala pledged in 2008 to ban corporal punishment, and in the absence of a State law enforcing the ban, will use the Juvenile Justice Act 2000 to punish offenders²⁶. The NCPCR has issued a set of guidelines on the efforts needed to abolish it within the educational system²⁷, and has communicated these guidelines to officials at the Central, State and district level.

A few States have resolved the contradiction between policy and law and abolished corporal punishment as a matter of law. The Goa Children’s Act 2003 categorically bans corporal punishment in all schools²⁸, as do the Andhra Pradesh Education Rules 1966 and the Tamil Nadu Education Rules²⁹.

8. WHAT MUST BE DONE?

The RTE Act as we have seen clearly outlaws corporal punishment. The rules for implementation of the Act will have to incorporate the procedures under criminal law to severely punish the perpetrators of violence which would be the school teachers as well as the school principal and the management if they have not taken adequate steps to

24. *Protection of Children against Corporal Punishment in Schools and Institutions: Summary discussions by the Working Group on Corporal Punishment*, National Commission for the Protection of Child Rights, 2008, p.14, available at http://www.ncpcr.gov.in/Reports/Protection_of_Children_against_Corporal_Punishment_in_Schools_and_Institutions_December_2008.pdf

25. *Ibid.*

26. “*Idukki, children’s own country*”, R. Babu, Hindustan Times, 14 January 2008, available at <http://www.hindustantimes.in/StoryPage/StoryPage.aspx?sectionName=NLetterand id=4d847165-69f3-4724-a3fe d771e0a517f3&Headline=Idukki%2c + children%27s + own + country>

27. *Ibid.*, p.5-7

28. Sec 4 (2)

29. http://www.ncpcr.gov.in/Reports/Status_of_Prohibition_SN_16_Feb_09.pdf

prevent violence on children and create a culture of non-violence in schools. Once a strong law is in place, it should be applicable to all other institutions where children are located in as in the case of juvenile homes, hostels for children, and so on. According to Peter Newell, “eliminating corporal punishment requires both clear and explicit law reform and sustained public and parent education about children’s right and the law... Law reform requires the removal of any authorisations of corporal punishment or defences of it which exists in any laws or in common (case) law... If all authorisations and defences are removed then the criminal law on assault should protect children as it protects assault on adults in all settings of their lives, whether or not the assault is disguised as discipline.”³⁰

A law banning all forms of corporal punishment is necessary and to be effective requires active participation of all of us, parents, civil society, and the schools teachers, education administration at all levels as well as all those responsible for management equally. There has to be multiple interventions beginning with a public campaign against all forms of violence on children. This must build an atmosphere where children, parents and child defenders alike gain confidence to speak up against the practice of corporal punishment. It is in this context that the directions of the National Commission for Protection of Child Rights regards participation of children to speak against corporal punishment and bring it to the notice of the authorities as important. While building the atmosphere through campaigns children should get the courage to make complaints and not accept punishment as a ‘normal’ activity of the school. Further every school, including hostels, JJ Homes, shelter homes and other public institutions meant for children must have a forum where children can express their views. Such institutions could take the help of an NGO for facilitating such an exercise.

30. Peter Newell, ‘The Global Progress towards Human Rights imperative to eliminate and prohibit all forms of Corporal Punishment’ Speech delivered on 4 February 2009, New Delhi, www.ncpcr.gov.in

A box where children can drop their complaints, even if anonymous has to be provided for in each school.

The Commission has also indicated that there has to be a monthly meeting of the PTAs/SMC's to review the complaints and take action. The PTAs are to be encouraged to act immediately on any complaints made by children without postponement of the issue and wait for a more grave injury to be caused. In other words the PTAs need not use their discretion to decide on the grievousness of the complaint.

Considering the fact that the school principal has a huge responsibility in ensuring that child rights are mainstreamed in the manner in which the school is run, the school management including the school principal must take equal responsibility for ensuring that corporal punishment is not practiced in schools. They must make every effort to see that the culture of violence on children is replaced with a culture of non-violence and positive engagement of the teacher with children. To prevent assault on children all the above set of practices are to be monitored by the education department as they are finally responsible for monitoring the schools

Further in case of severe violence resulting in hospitalisation or death of a child, the Commission has directed that there has to be criminal proceedings against the school teacher and the management and immediate suspension of the teacher concerned, pending departmental enquiry. The expenses towards health has to be met by the school/education department, and the child has to be supported through scholarship, fee waiver and other school charges by the government until completion of school education. In case of suicide there has to be booking of charges of aid and abetment to suicide on the concerned school teacher and the child who attempts to commit suicide shall be given counselling and all support to live a normal life.

The government school teachers often justify violence as they find the work conditions are undoubtedly adverse.

There are overcrowded classes, not enough textbooks, first-generation learners etc. But children are not responsible for all these problems that teachers face in performing their duties. The teacher must take up these issues through their unions with the education system. It is incorrect to victimize the children who are the weakest in the system who can never provide answers to structural deficiencies. Besides, this is not to say that there is no violence or corporal punishment on children in well-to do schools. Teachers also often mention that without disciplining children, it is difficult to have any meaningful transaction in the classroom.

The more fundamental issue is whether children are to be disciplined. The current debate has substituted the practice of 'positive discipline' of children in the place of corporal punishment. Although the elements of positive discipline emphasise interaction with children, respecting them and not punishing them, it is still within the bounds of a structure of authority of the teacher of the child. There is an undercurrent of acceptance that children need to be disciplined and told how to behave. This again positions the teacher and the child in an unequal relationship. It is important that the vocabulary used in this context changes to express equality in relationship. Thus, a more apt concept is the use of 'positive engagement' of the teacher with the children.

In this sense school teachers must know that their professional rights as teachers are linked to children's rights in schools. One reinforces the other. The teachers would gain authority to bargain for better conditions of work and to be respected as teachers only if they are in a position to show that no matter what, children would be seen as equal partners and school is the best place where their process of learning is enhanced along with children having an access to all other rights. Thus the school teachers and the principal are not in any adversarial position *vis a vis* the children and their parents and therefore they need to welcome any feedback from the child,

or a meeting with the parents and not be defensive. Further, since teachers are in a position of trust and with complete knowledge of the child's moods, sense of security and insecurity, learning pace and behaviour, they should recognise when the child is seeking attention and be quick to discuss the matter with the child in confidence. If it is a problem of a child being abused at home, the teacher should be supportive of the child and in a position to look for remedies rather than blaming the parents. Thus from a position of power and authority the school teacher should play a role of a mentor and a guide.

9. END CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

In a way, ending corporal punishment is part of the history of unfolding of values that emphasise core humanistic principles of equality, freedom and justice and rights of individuals over the centuries such as emancipation of indentured and bonded labour, freeing serfs and peasantry from feudal forces of production and cultures, liberating countries and its peoples from colonial powers and imperialism. Until these shackles were broken it was felt that subjugation of people was inevitable and natural and that there was nothing unethical or immoral about prevalence of domination of one over the other. The absolute value of human rights as inviolable has gained acceptance over the years and has come to stay. Anchoring on this women have asserted against patriarchy, the marginalised communities and groups have claimed rights both cultural and economic against overarching project of exclusionary modernisation and continue to challenge the existing structure of economy, society and polity. In exercising their agency and in their acts of resistance they have questioned the existing hierarchies and structures of domination and power that inflicted violence on them – physical and emotional – and are constantly negotiating spaces in their favour.

Each time a new layer of society gains confidence to question and thus contributes to sharpening of what

constitutes human values and daily practices of actualising the new tradition; there is discovery of one more layer of domination that needs correction. In this instance it is the domination of the child by the adults. The liberty to treat children with authority by the adults comes from the understanding that children are less than adults and that the adults have a duty as well as a responsibility to control and discipline children. Therefore in the best interest of children adults can use force and violence to correct them. Thus the act of violence and exercise of power of the adult over the child is repeatedly justified. It is seldom regarded that children are individuals in their own right and equal to adults.

This happens even in a family situation. Children are subject to insults and are not heard quite inadvertently by adults. Punishing a child is seen as parental responsibility. The moment there is defiance of the child it is construed as being disrespectful. And so, the child is further admonished, very much like in the context of the school. Having no options children accept this as a reality and learn to live with it. The challenge is really in protecting children and making them feel secure and at the same time enhancing the quality of relationship between the adult and the child. For, in principle family as an institution should be the best place for any child.

Indeed the questioning of domination of the adults, say 'adulthood' over the child is part of this unfolding of the human spirit and in favour of respecting a culture of empathy and non-violence that should govern the relationship between adults and children in a cultured society. The difference in this endeavour is that those who are dominated are children and are especially vulnerable due to their inherent powerlessness in an adult society. What distinguishes children from adults is that their capacities are evolving and so would require greater care and protection. It is in the ambience of non-violence and respect that they fully develop to becoming confident individuals in their own right. They need tremendous

support of the adults to be heard. They are entirely dependent on adults and thus in no position to charter any independent path without adult support. The answer to the violence on children is adults and not resistance of children.

This is indeed a challenge. The world of adults must acquire the unique capabilities to pay special attention to have children's opinions heard and respect the dignity and rights of every child in every circumstance. Children are as human and sensitive as adults are, if not more. They need to be secure with a caring atmosphere and this is an adult responsibility. Practicing non-violence as a highest form of culture begins with seeing children as children. It is necessary for adults to behave with them in a manner that they are not subject to violence and hurt of any kind. In a way fostering such a culture will develop adults as responsible adults who would in turn be vigilant and question those that are breaking the norms of respecting childhood. In so doing inculcate the values of non-violence in children; adults cannot preach non-violence when perpetrating violence.

What is required therefore is to build skills of school teachers, care givers and adults at large to engage with children as equals, listen to them and address their concerns in a manner that does not hurt or humiliate them.

ABOUT THE SPEAKER

Professor Shantha Sinha is India's foremost activist in the field of elimination of child labour. She has been actively involved in programmes for elimination of child labour through universalisation of education in 13 districts of Andhra Pradesh covering more than 6000 villages in 137 mandals through M. V. Foundation, of which she was Secretary for many years. This has resulted in over 600,000 children in the 5-14 years age group being withdrawn from work over the last 18 years. It has also helped in strengthening of government schools in 1500 villages with retention of 99% of all children in schools. At present the focus of the foundation is on girl-children and children engaged as bonded labourers, partnership with government teachers, women's groups, youth associations, PTAs and local bodies; and training and networking with other NGOs.

MVF also provides technical support to the SSA in Madhya Pradesh, 10 districts in Assam, and to NGOs in Bihar, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Orissa, Rajasthan. It has extended its technical support to NGOs working in Nepal, Morocco, Kenya, Zimbabwe and Honduras.

Professor Sinha has changed the way people in Andhra Pradesh and India think about child labour and child rights. She has proven to the world that the poor and marginalised can think for themselves and want an education for their children, thereby shattering the elitist myth of poverty being the cause of child labour.

The Government of India, for the first time, set up a Commission exclusively for Protection of Child Rights in the country. Professor Shantha Sinha was selected to head this Commission as its first Chairperson in March 2007.

On expiry of her first term on 4 March 2010, for the excellent work done by her, the Government of India has again appointed her Chairperson, National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPDR) for a second term from 18 May 2010 to 17 May 2013.

In 1998 Shantha Sinha was honoured with the Padmashri by the President of India and the Albert Shanker International Award (from Education International, Washington D.C.) in recognition of M V Foundation's outstanding work in the field of eliminating child labour and spreading education.

In 2003 Shantha was awarded the prestigious Ramon Magsaysay Award for Community Leadership for guiding the people of Andhra Pradesh in ending the scourge of child labour.

She was awarded the "Goldene Feder" Award by Bauer Publishing House, Germany in 2007.

In addition she has received several other awards, both national and international and much recognition for her vision and leadership in protecting child rights.

Shantha's work has resulted in putting child rights especially child labour on the national agenda for the first time in the country's history, a remarkable achievement and a lasting contribution to the nation.

ANNEXURE I
Memorial Lectures 2007-08

| Name | Date | Venue | Speaker | Theme | Chairperson |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Mahatma Gandhi Memorial Lecture | 17 January 2007 | India International Centre, New Delhi | Professor Christopher Winch Educational Philosophy and Policy, Kings College London, UK | Individuals, Workers or Citizens: Reflections on the Limits of School-based Educational Reform | Professor Mrinal Miri <i>Former Vice Chancellor</i> NEHU, Shillong |
| Zakir Husain Memorial Lecture | 19 January 2007 | RIE Mysore | Dr Radhika Herzberger, <i>Director</i> Rishi Valley School Chittoor Andhra Pradesh | Religion, Education and Peace | Prof. B.L. Chaudhary <i>Vice Chancellor</i> Mohanal Sukhadia University, Udaipur Rajasthan |
| Mahadevi Verma Memorial Lecture | 17 August 2007 | RIE Bhopal | Prof. Karuna Chanana <i>Former Professor</i> Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies School of Social Sciences, JNU | Women in Indian Academe; Diversity Difference and Inequality in a Contested Domain | Prof. R.S. Sirohi <i>Vice Chancellor</i> Barkatulla University Bhopal |
| B.M. Pugh Memorial Lecture | 11 March 2008 | Laitumkhrakh Women's College Shillong | Shri Ratan Thiyam <i>Chairperson</i> , Chorus Repertory Theatre Imphal | Theatre Language and Expression | Professor T. Ao <i>Dean</i> , School of Humanities, NEHU Shillong |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Marjorie Sykes Memorial Lecture | 8 April 2008 | RIE Ajmer Jawahar Rang Manch, Ajmer | Ms Medha Patkar Social Activist | Socialisation vs Politics of Education | Professor M.S. Agwani Former Vice Chancellor JNU |
| Sri Aurobindo Memorial Lecture | 2 July 2008 | Dorozio Hall Presidency College Kolkata | Shri Manoj Das International Centre of Education Sri Aurobindo Ashram Puducherry | Education for a Faith in the Future | Professor Sanjib Ghosh Principal, Presidency College, Kolkata |
| Rabindranath Tagore Memorial Lecture | 19 July 2008 | RIE Bhubaneswar | Professor N.R. Menon Member, Commission on Centre State Relations | Realising Equality of Status and of Opportunity: Role of Government, Judiciary and Civil Society | Professor Chandrashekhar Rath Eminent Writer |
| Gijubhai Badekha Memorial Lecture* | 11 September 2009 | RIE Mysore | Shri U.R. Anantha Murthy Jnanpith Awardee | My Writing My Times | Professor G.H. Nayak Kannada Literary Critic |
| Savitribai Phule Memorial Lecture | 12 December 2008 | Maniben Nanavati Women's College, Mumbai | Dr Sunderaraman Director State Health System Resource | The Educational Institution as a Health Facility | Dr (Ms) Vibhuti Patel Professor, Head and Director PGSK SNDT Women's University, Mumbai |

*Lecture was delivered in 2009 because the speaker was ill in 2008.

ANNEXURE II
Memorial Lectures 2008-09

| Name | Date | Venue | Speaker | Theme | Chairperson |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|--|
| Mahatma Gandhi Memorial Lecture | 28 January 2009 | National Institute of Education NCERT New Delhi | Shri Anupam Mishra Gandhi Peace Foundation Delhi | Raj Samaj Aur Pani | Professor M. H. Gureshi <i>Former Professor</i> Geography, Centre for the Study of Regional Development JNU |
| Zakir Husain Memorial Lecture | 30 January 2009 | RIE Mysore | Professor Padmini Swaminathan Madras Institute of Development Studies Chennai | Literacy and Levels of Formal (General and Professional) Education of the Indian Population: A National Report Card | Professor B. Shaik Ali <i>Former</i> <i>Vice Chancellor</i> Mangalore University and Goa University |
| Mahadevi Verma Memorial Lecture | 5 January 2009 | RIE Bhopal | Ms Kalpana Sharma <i>Former Chief of the Bureau, The Hindu</i> Mumbai | Can Media Teach us Anything? | Dr Pushpendra Pal Singh <i>Head, Department of Journalism, National University of Journalism and Communication, Bhopal</i> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Rabindranath Tagore Memorial Lecture | 14 January 2009 | RIE Bhubneswar | Professor Swapan Majumdar <i>Director, Culture and Relations</i> Visva Bharati | Education as Empowerment: Twins in Search of an Alternative Education | Professor Shantanu Kumar Acharya <i>Eminent Writer</i> |
| Gijubhai Badekha Memorial Lecture | 20 January 2009 | MIDS Chennai | Professor T. S. Saraswathi, <i>Former Professor</i> , Maharaja Sayaji Rao University Baroda | Culture and Development Implication for Classroom Practices | Professor S. Janakarajan <i>Director</i> Madras Institute of Development Studies Chennai |
| Savitribai Phule Memorial Lecture | 29 January 2009 | SNDT Women's University Mumbai | Professor Sharmila Rege <i>Director</i> Kratijyoti Savitribai Phule Women's Study Centre, University of Pune | Education as Triptiya Ratna: Towards Phule Ambedkarite Feminist Pedagogies | Professor Chandra Krishnamurthy <i>Vice Chancellor</i> SNDT Women's University Mumbai |
| Sri Aurobindo Memorial Lecture | 27 March 2009 | Presidency College Kolkata | Professor Jasodhara Bagchi, <i>Former Professor</i> Jadavpur University Kolkata | Education for Women and Women for Education: the Case of Bengal | Professor Sanjib Ghosh <i>Principal</i> Presidency College Kolkata |
| B. M. Pugh Memorial Lecture | 27 March 2009 | Don Bosco Youth Centre Shillong | Shri P. Sainath <i>Rural Affairs Editor</i> The Hindu, Mumbai | India in the Age of Inequality: Farm Crisis, Food Crisis and the Media | Ms Patricia Mukhim <i>Editor</i> Shillong Times |
| Marjorie Sykes Memorial Lecture | 28 October 2009 | RIE Ajmer | Professor Kamal Datta <i>Former Professor</i> Department of Physics University of Delhi | What should we Teach? An Examination of Issues Underlying the College Curriculum | Professor Bhagirath Singh <i>Vice Chancellor</i> MDS University Ajmer |

ANNEXURE III
Memorial Lectures 2009-10

| Name | Date | Venue | Speaker | Theme | Chairperson |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Mahatma Gandhi Memorial Lecture | 9 February 2010 | India International Centre New Delhi | Shri Jatin Das <i>Chairman</i> J.D. Centre of Art | Art at Home, School, University and in Public Life | Shri Ashok Vajpeyi <i>Chairman</i> Lalit Kala Akademi Delhi |
| Zakir Husain Memorial Lecture* | | | | | |
| Mahadevi Verma Memorial Lecture | 11 February 2010 | RIE Bhopal | Shri Arvind Gupta | Science through Activities | Dr M.N. Buch I.A.S. (Retd) <i>Chairman</i> , National Centre for Human Settlement and Environment, Bhopal |
| B. M. Pugh Memorial Lecture | 9 October 2009 | N.E.C.A. Nongrim Hills Shillong | Professor Nandini Sundar <i>Professor of Sociology</i> Delhi School of Economics Delhi University | Social and Political Exclusion, Religious Inclusion: The Advasi Guest in Education | Dr Kharkonger Glen <i>Vice Chancellor</i> Martin Luther Christian University Shillong |
| Rabindranath Tagore Memorial Lecture* | | | | | |
| Gijubhai Badekha Memorial Lecture* | | | | | |
| Savitribai Phule Memorial Lecture* | | | | | |
| Sri Aurobindo Memorial Lecture* | | | | | |
| Marjorie Sykes Memorial Lecture* | | | | | |

*These lectures are yet to be organised.

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES