

A Compilation of Comments on the [National Education Policy Framework \(2023-2033\)](#) or related discourses available in the public domain
compiled by Sujata Gamage for personal use and shared in the public interest
(Work in progress)

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. Dialogue on the National Education Policy Framework Jan 23, 2024, BALPP	1
2. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලාශ්‍රය ද?, March xx, University of Peradeniya, Part 01	1
3. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලාශ්‍රය ද?, April 06, University of Peradeniya, Part 02	1
4. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලාශ්‍රය ද?, April 18, Colombo Public Library	1
5. NEPF, April 21, National movement for Social Justice (NMSJ), Ajith Amarasinghe	2
6. ඉලෙක්‍ට්‍රොනික් වාර්තාව, අද්විත, අසම්පූර්ණ ලියවිලි, Anidda, April 22, 2024. Ajith Amarasinghe	3
7. Nirmal Devasiri, මාධ්‍ය හමුව, April 22, කොළඹ විශ්වවිද්‍යාල ශාස්ත්‍රීය පීඨ ආචාර්ය සංගමය	3
8. Nadeesh de Silva, OUSL මාධ්‍ය හමුව, April 22, කොළඹ විශ්වවිද්‍යාල ශාස්ත්‍රීය පීඨ ආචාර්ය සංගමය	4
9. Arjuna Parakrama, Misc	4
10. Chameera Dedduwage, Education Policy Forum WhatsApp Group, April 24, 2024	5
11. FUTA, April 26, 2024	8
12. ජාතික අධ්‍යාපන පරිසරයක් සකස් කිරීමේ රාමුව හරිද වැරදිද?, ජනරජ කතිකා, May 02, 2024	8
13. අධ්‍යාපන පරිසරයක් සකස් කිරීමේ Monara TV, May 01, 2024	9
14. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපන කොමිෂන් , කුසල පරෙණේරා, May 05, 2015	9
15. පෞද්ගලික විශ්ව විද්‍යාල අවශ්‍යද? Anuruddha Pradeep and Rohan Samarajiva, දකුණු ඉවුර, April 11	9
16. වෛද්‍ය විද්‍යාල , රත්නාන් සමරසිංහ, Ft.lk, april 19, https://theleader.lk/featured/23214-2024-04-19-11-40-38	9

Nrimal ith Prof Gambheera <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YJzosvef4cl>

- Dialogue on the National Education Policy Framework Jan 23, 2024, BALPP
<https://t.co/zGb4Z31vMW>
- පරිසරයේ හොඳයි. පරිසරයේ අඩුයි. Sujata gamage
<https://youtu.be/JmfwuVBF6Jg?si=zxAvZHMnnBaYuFpE>
- නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලාශ්‍රය ද?, March xx, University of Peradeniya, Part 01
<https://youtu.be/uhlLIMeq-jQ?si=x5N04dcD9UDqzS5N>
- නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලාශ්‍රය ද?, April 06, University of Peradeniya, Part 02
Sujata Gamage, Charitha Herath, Atulasiri Samarakoon,
https://youtu.be/RZwACxJK3iU?si=cTURmx5ITfR6r_t
- නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලාශ්‍රය ද?, April 18, Colombo Public Library
Dr. Pavithra Jayewardene, April 18, Colombo Public Library
නව අධ්‍යාපන පරිසරයක් සකස් කිරීමේ රාමුව ජනතාවට නිවැරදිව පැහැදිලි කිරීම!
<https://youtu.be/FWjo3b3axtw?si=cT1-XPymbkBg>

රාජ්‍ය ව්‍යවසාය ප්‍රතිව්‍යුහගත කිරීම ගැන දැනුවත් කරන්න සලලි තියනවා

13:17 නව ලොව වාදි දෘෂ්ටි කණ්ඩායමක් බංකු, ප්‍රාදේශීය හැකි ඉකමනින් මේවා ප්‍රාග්ධනීකරණය කරමු. ඒ සන්දර්භය ඇතුළේ තමයි මේ ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණ එන්නේ. අහිප්‍රාය අධ්‍යාපනයෙන් බිහිවන අය හදන්නේ ජ්‍යාන්තර වලෙද පොලට. අපි ප්‍රධාන වස්තූන් හදනවා ජ්‍යාන්තර වලෙද පොලට. අධ්‍යාපනය විකුනවා විතරක් නවෙයි ඒ ප්‍රධාන වස්තූන් හදන්නේ අපි වෙනුවෙන් නොවෙයි. නිෂ්පාදන ආර්ථිකයකට

07:10 සිරියා නැති ලියවිලි

පිටු 400 ක ගැඹුරු ලියවිලි තිබියදී ඒ ගැන සඳහන් නැහැ.

Reference ලියවිලි ප්‍රකාශ නැහැ.

Glossary එකක් නැහැ.

පරිවර්තනයේ ප්‍රශ්න තියනවා.

Revisit, Redefine, Optimize

ජ්‍යාන්තර පරිමිත අනුව කියනවා - මොනවාද ඒ පරිමිත කියන්නේ නැහැ.

අපට ඕනි ජ්‍යාන්තර බල කේන්ද්‍ර වලට ඕනි හැටියට හැසිරෙන්නද?

අධ්‍යාපනයේ සියලු අංශ

අපේක්ෂිත පරිවර්තනය වෙස්සම - වසර කිරීම සමහර විට වෙනුවෙන් ඇති වාණිජ මණ්ඩලයට වඩා කුඩාය. නිර්මාණය

14:00

කඩුළු හඳුනා එක්කනවා

මනවාදය ප්‍රධාන වාදය; ඒකට අනු වර්තන තරකයි.

ආර්ථික අර්බුදයේ වගකීම අධ්‍යාපනයට පවරනවා.

25 දෙනාගේ අධ්‍යාපනිකයන් තැනිතුවට, නිර්දේශ කරනවා කිරීමත් අද්විතීයත්වයත් සැලසුම් ලත්

උපදේශක මණ්ඩලයක්

තොරතුරු තාක්ෂණ උපදෙස් දෙන

20:15 විධායක සාරාංශය

" රාජ්‍ය පාසල පද්ධතිය තුළින් ලබාදෙන අධ්‍යාපන සේවාවන්හි දක්නට ලැබෙන අනේකවිධ

දුර්වලතාවයන්ට විසඳුම් ලෙස කිසිදු නියාමනයකින් තොරව ක්‍රියාත්මක වමේන් පවතින වාණිජමය

සවුරුපයේ ප්‍රාදේශීය අධ්‍යාපන ජාලයක් ඊට පුරා අතිශය අවිධිමත් අයුරින් නිර්මාණය වී ඇත."

විසඳුම ලෙස කියන්නේ:

" එවැනි අතිශය ගතික අනාගතවාදී වාතාවරණයක් තුළ ශිෂ්‍ය ප්‍රජාවන් සඳහා තවදුරටත් අමාත්‍යාංශය මෙන්ම නියාමන ආයතන, ජාතික විභාග, සහතිකකරණය, සහ පවතින අධ්‍යාපන ව්‍යුහයන් එතරම් වැදගත් නොවීය හැකි බව මෙයින් අදහස් කරේ"

අවසාන වශයෙන්:

ජනතාවට කරපු නිර්මාණය, විකුනන්න හදන්නේ අධ්‍යාපනයම පමණක් නොවෙයි. අපිව නැවතත් යට විජිත සාමයේ තිබුණු ගැති තත්වයකට ගෙයනවා.

6. NEPF, April 21, National movement for Social Justice (NMSJ), Ajith Amarasinghe

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=92FAoNn3SJA>

00:00 බහු විධ දේශපාලන පක්ෂ පවතින පාර්ලිමේන්තුවක මෙවැනි ලියවිලික දේශපාලන පක්ෂ වලින් සැදුණු කමිටුවක් මගින් නිර්මාණය විය යුතුය.

5:00 නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපන සංකල්පය ගැන මූලික සඳහන් නැත.

6:40 ස්වකර්මය හරියට කෙරේ නැත. කපුණු අත මතෙත.කපුණු කියවලා නැහැ කියලා හිතනවා. බැලුවාම තව නැතත් තියනවා.

7:29 මධ්‍යාහ්න /විමර්ශන කිරීමේ සංකල්ප පැහැදිලි නැහැ
 8:40 ස්වයං පාලන යෝජනාව / මූල්‍යම ස්වාධීන මණ්ඩල ගණනාකයි.
 10:18 දූෂණ පාසල වලට
 10:45 මූල්‍ය ලබා විය සංවර්ධනයේ පෙර පාසල නියාමනය ජාතික අධ්‍යාපන ආයතනයට පැවරීම හොඳයි.
 12:40 පරාජයේ අධ්‍යාපනයේ ශිෂ්‍යත්ව විභාගය ගැන සඳහන් නැහැ
 14:10 කතිෂ්ඨ දිවිනියක අවධියේ විෂය ගණන වැඩියි. කිරිඳි අධ්‍යාපනය ගැන නැහැ.
 15:17 ජයසේන දිවිනියක අධ්‍යාපනය
 16:14 වැරදි ඉලක්කය .

7. ඉලෙක්ස වරදවාගත්, අදමුටු, අසම්පූර්ණ ලියවිලි, Anidda, April 22, 2024. Ajith Amarasinghe
<https://theleader.lk/featured/23263-2024-04-22-06-09-20>

- සුභාග්‍ය බව
- ආර්ථික ස්ථාවරත්වය වහාම ඇතිකර ගැනීමේ කඩිනම් වැඩපිළිවලට සරිලන ලෙස අධ්‍යාපනය වන සිසුන්ගේ අභ්‍යන්තරයෙන් එය සකස්කොට ඇති බව තම තමාපෙන්
- මූල්‍ය ලබාදීම සිට 12+ දක්වා පාසල අධ්‍යාපනය සඳහා සිසුන්ගේ ගවේෂණ ඇති නැතිවීමට කිසිදු බාධාවක් නොවන පරිදි අධ්‍යාපනය සඳහා වන රාජ්‍ය අරමුදල සාමාන්‍ය අධ්‍යාපනය වන යොමු කිරීමට පරමාදායක ලබාදිය යුතුය. සිතාමතා මවෙති වැරදි පරිසරයක් කිරීමෙන්ම මේ ලියවිලි ලේ සැඟවුණු කතාවන්ගේ අභ්‍යන්තරත්වය මුදල් ගවේෂණ සාමාන්‍ය අධ්‍යාපනයකට මේ රට තුළ මුළුතැන් දීම බව පැහැදිලිය.
- මේ ලියවිලි ලේ විවිධ තැන්වල ඉස්මතු කරන අදහස් තම රජයට අධ්‍යාපනයේ මුළු බරපත දැරිය නොහැකි නිසා අධ්‍යාපනයේ කොටසක් පුද්ගලික අංශයට භාරදිය යුතු බවයි. මේ තර්කය මුළුමනින්ම වැරදිය.
- හතළිස්පන්වන මහේ බිහිවී ඇති ජාත්‍යන්තර පාසල නමින් හඳුන්වන පාසල නියාමනය කිරීමට කිසිදු යෝජනාවක් ඇතුළු නොවන්නේ ඇයි දැයි වටහා ගත නොහැක.
- ස්වයං පාලන මණ්ඩලවලට විවිධ අයුරින් මුදල් සොයාගැනීමේ බලතල ලබාදිය යුතු බව තවත් තැනක සඳහන් වේ. මේ ස්වයං පාලන මණ්ඩල අවසාන වශයෙන් කලාවර වනු ඇත්තේ මූල්‍යමය වශයෙන් ස්වාධීන, සිසුන්ගෙන් මුදල් අයකර ගන්නා ආයතන ලෙසිනි. මේ යෝජනාව කිරියාත්මක වුවහොත් මේ රටේ අධ්‍යාපනය තෝරාගත් පිරිසකගේ මවෙලමක්ව පැවති කල තිබූ "පාසල සමාගම" යුගයකට අප රට ආපසු හැරී ගමන් කරනු ඇත.
- මූල්‍ය ලබා විය ආයතන අධිකරණය සඳහා ඇති මූල්‍ය ලබාදීම සංවර්ධන ලේකම් කාර්යාලය ජාතික අධ්‍යාපන ආයතනය වන අන්තර්ගතයන් සිට මේ ලියවිලි ලේ ඇති වැදගත් යෝජනාවකි. මේ කාර්යාලය ඉන්පසුව මේ ආයතනවල විෂය නිර්දේශ, ඉගැන්වීම අධිකරණය කිරීම, පෙර පාසල ගුරුවරුන්ගේ පුහුණුව විධිමත් කිරීම වැනි දෑ සිදුකළ යුතුය.
- මේ පරිපත් රාමුවේ කිසිම තැනක පස්වැනි ශ්‍රේණියේ ශිෂ්‍යත්වය ගැන හෝ එය පරාජයේ අධ්‍යාපනයට ඇතිකරන බලපෑම ගැන හෝ සඳහන් නොකරයි.
- එක් විසඳුමක් නම් මේ විභාගය හත්වැනි ශ්‍රේණියේ කළ දමා ජනප්‍රිය පාසල වල පන්ති හයවැනි ශ්‍රේණියේදී නොව අවසන් ශ්‍රේණියට පසුව පලව කිරීමයි.
- හයවැනි ශ්‍රේණියේ සිට දහවන ශ්‍රේණිය දක්වා කාලය වන මෙය මේ ලියවිලි ලේ අඩුම අවධානය යොමුකර ඇති කොටස වේ. වැදගත් අධ්‍යාපන අංශයක් වන "කිරිඳි අධ්‍යාපනය" යන වචනය පවා පිටු 31 ක මේ ලියවිලි ලේ කතානැතක වත් සඳහන් නොවේ.
- ජයසේන දිවිනිය හා ජයසේන අවධිය: මේ අවධියේ පිළිබඳ මතකේ පලවූ ලියවිලි හෝ කිරියාත්මක කළ වැඩපිළිවලට අමතර කිසිදු නව කල්පනා මේ ලියවිලි ලේ අඩංගුව නැත. පාසලේ දැරුවන් ගතකළ යුතු වසර ගණන අඩු කිරීමට මේ ලියවිලි ලේ ඇති යෝජනාව හා අනෙකුත් යෝජනා මීට පෙර කිහිප වතාවක් විවිධ ලියවිලිවල පැවසී තිබේ.

Nirmal Devasiri, මාධ්‍ය හමුව, April 22, කොළඹ විශ්වවිද්‍යාල ශාස්ත්‍ර පීඨ ආචාර්ය සංගමය
 Nirmal Devasiri, <https://www.facebook.com/share/v/AXYieGLvYpjw6SAf/?mibextid=jmPrMh>

5:45 සුරෙන් රසවත් උසස් අධ්‍යාපන රාජ්‍ය ඇමැතින් මේක දන්නේ නැහැ කියනවා
 7:02 ජාතික අධ්‍යාපන කොමිසිමි වාර්තාව ගැන සඳහන් නැහැ
 9:00 අධ්‍යාපන පිළිබඳ තහවුරු වී ඇති මූලධර්ම (අධ්‍යාපන අයිතිය) අහියෝගයට ලක් කරනවා
 10:22 අධ්‍යාපනය වලඳපොල කරනවා වලො. මේක අධ්‍යාපනය එය අනුව සකස් කරන්න හදනවා.
 12:00 අධ්‍යයනයේ අරමුණු ගැන සඳහන් නැහැ.
 13:00 රාජ්‍ය හා රාජ්‍ය නොවන ආයතන එක තලයකට ගෙනෙනවා
 13:50 අධ්‍යාපනයේ පරිවෘත්තිය මතේ පුද්ගලික සපයාගන්න තත්වයකට එනවා. පොදු අධ්‍යාපනයේ

8. Nadeesh de Silva, OUSL මාධ්‍ය හමුව, April 22, කොළඹ විශ්වවිද්‍යාල ශාස්ත්‍ර පීඨ ආචාර්ය
 සංගමය

6:16, , <https://fb.watch/rDbmbXOwz7/>

9. Arjuna Parakrama, Misc

Arjuna Parakrama, 4:17, https://fb.watch/rB_khEieXo/

00:000 NEC has excellent analysis; Not used

00:31 No mention of piriven educaiton of international education

001:25 Expected transformatins 35-41 erodes free higher education

01:30 Translation is deliberately falsified and distorted

02:43 UGC trashed; UGC is to become a place to find employment for foreign graduates

03:20 Little concern about the public view and views of those who should be consulted.

විශ්වවිද්‍යාල යන්න මුදල් අයකරන අධ්‍යාපනයේ බේදවාචකය | Inside Voice,

Arjuna Parakrama, 35:10, <https://youtu.be/jlmn6U95G9g?si=oek6a3k4OVSODSDr>

Prof. Arjuna Parakrama comments on an invitation to join WhatsApp group

Please say the following:

1. Such national initiatives, especially the creation of WhatsApp groups and other social media platforms, should be done in a public, open and transparent way.
2. To conduct such work on a purely personal invitation basis is problematic, especially when the convenor wears multiple hats, including in official capacities to write up, follow up and implement the very policies that are under discussion.
3. The only reasonable conclusion to be drawn, if 1 and 2 are accurate, is that there is a clear conflict of interest involved, and that, as a result, the forum may be used for multiple purposes.
4. For instance, was there an open disclosure made at the outset stipulating the involvement of a person or persons officially tasked with the acts of drafting, implementing etc of these reform proposals?
5. Was there also clear disclosure that some persons previously involved in the general initiatives, and whose names are prominently contained on the relevant institutional sites, have not been involved in the current specific initiative? Have they agreed to lend their names to this particular initiative? It remains to be seen whether the institution itself has a potential conflict of interest if it is selected to implement or monitor some of the reform programmes.
6. The clear issue here is that some members of this group, including its livewire and founder, have already been TASKED with implementing the NEPF document, so that while others may be engaged in suggesting changes, this is not only a fait accompli, but it is also already being implemented, tweaked and monitored by some in this group.

7. I have long been engaged in matters related to education and education policy. For this reason, I do not want to be co-opted into an initiative that I see is not transparently or accountably begun or continued.

SUGGESTION:

8. I recommend that a set of core principles be presented at the outset, which will found and anchor the decisions: I strongly recommend the four guiding principles suggested for the NEPF document: (free education, education as a right, addressing educational disparities as the first priority, and providing basic needs to students as a prerequisite for meaningful education in this catastrophic economic crisis situation). This will go a long way to alleviating any doubts and concerns as well.

I would appreciate if this is circulated on your site.

Arjuna Parakrama

10. Chameera Dedduwage, Education Policy Forum WhatsApp Group, April 24, 2024

1. Shifting funding from universities to students
2. No line-item based funding
3. Expecting universities to go after the industry for funding,
4. Poorly defined umbrella term 'industry'
5. (Corollary to that) If Industry is taken to mean businesses, then businesses having the privilege of directing where public tax money goes (which courses)
6. Student loans that prohibit students from actively participating in politics, including street protests
7. Inherent assumption that universities have a duty to provide a good 'workforce'
8. Unclear scope of admission criteria and how each university will have the reins to adjust them
9. Deliberate shift to 'marketable' degrees as opposed to 'academic' degrees
10. Lack of transparency in how this will be regulated

A Critique of the Proposed National Education Policy Reform

The recently published educational policy document under the title 'National Education Policy Reform' (NEPF for short) has been the subject of much criticism. Various parties have expressed their grave concerns about this proposed NEPF on many platforms. This document attempts to cover some angles which the author deems less covered in other criticisms. This critique is by no means complete or exhaustive; rather, the author prefers that it be read in conjunction with other such criticisms.

Lack of Stakeholder Participation

From the onset of reading, a critical inadequacy of this policy reform comes to light. According to the only available copy on the internet, it is the government of Sri Lanka who seems to have commissioned this reform, via a Cabinet Sub-Committee. This sub-committee is quoted as having "ten members, chaired by the President, including the Prime Minister and the Minister of Education".

It is imperative that a policy reform of this magnitude involves all stakeholders, including but not limited to educational experts, educators, trade unions, university students, etc. No such participation is evident from the authorship. Indeed, of the ten members of this sub-committee who drafted this, only three are publicly acknowledged. Such anonymity regarding a national policy that affects the lives of 4.4 million students is simply unacceptable.

Furthermore, participation from even the most pertinent stakeholders is astonishingly missing – the Federation of University Teachers Association (FUTA) and the Inter-University Student Federation) IUSF among many. A policy reform dialogue that eliminates the largest academic

body and the largest university student union, respectively, cannot be called 'fair and inclusive', for obvious reasons.

Reduction of Humans to Human Capital

Throughout the document, the role assigned to education (especially tertiary education) appears increasingly questionable. The preface states that "reforms are needed in this sector", for "economic stability and development". This leads us to speculate the authors' philosophy towards education is not one of social welfare and justice but economics. This speculation is further strengthened by the choice of words in Chapter 1, introduction, which states that "The Education Sector is a key driver of human capital development".

With all due respect to the authors of NEPF, we wish to register our vehement objection to this view. To reduce humans to 'human capital' is a blatant objectification of the country's citizenry. It reduces the entire able-bodied population to one dimension, namely, their employability and economic output. Such a reductionist view may be acceptable as the view of profit-oriented businesses, but that should not be the view of a state.

In the same vein, something that we cannot emphasise enough is that the purpose of education is not to create employability. Employability is indeed a direct consequence of education, but that should not be taken as a just cause to reduce education to create a malleable workforce. To draw upon a colourful metaphor, water is indeed required to make tea, but the purpose of water is not to make tea. We will see how this flawed, reductionist view manifests itself throughout the various parts of the proposed NEPF.

Subjecting Universities to the Wishes of Profit-earning Businesses

Here, our primary resource is the section 08 of the proposed NEPF. It contains 13 clauses.

Clause 8.4 is the one that explicitly addresses funding for tertiary education institutes. It states that funding for tertiary education will be threefold: government grants, student contributions, and other income.

It seems that the term 'grants' in this document is used to mean two different things: in the first sense, it means a collective pool of grants available to all state and private institutions (more on this later). The second sense means grants given to students. For clarity, we will differentiate the two by using 'institute grants' and 'student grants', respectively.

Having made this distinction, it should be noted that clause 8.4 refers to student grants, not institute grants. How will these grants be determined? Clause 8.4.1 makes this rather unhelpful claim: "These funds may include incentives to increase enrolments in subjects in demand by the industry". It goes on to say that these funds further include [a] "transitional arrangement endorsed by the Industry Sector Skills Council". Essentially, the 'industry' (which is quite vague - which industry/industries?) through the Skills Council, will dictate which courses are funded by taxpayers' money.

The immediate question is, who determines what subjects are in demand by the industry? The document offers no clear definition for the term 'industry'. In the absence of such a definition, we can reasonably assume that it means 'businesses', by which we mean "privately owned, profit-oriented entities". These privately owned, profit-earning entities then liaise with the Ministry of Education via the "Industry Sector Skills Council" to communicate what skills are "in demand". In other words, under the proposed NEPF, private business owners will dictate public funds.

This short clarification should highlight a massive shortcoming of this policy, viz., subjecting public education to the demands of privately owned, profit-oriented entities. By what virtue should these privately owned, profit-oriented businesses ("Industry") have a say in directing which courses should be taught by public funds?

Clause 8.4.3 further exacerbates the problem. The clause reads: "Other income secured by education institutions for research and commercialization projects shall be rewarded with

additional finances through a dedicated fund.” What this essentially means is that universities must now go out and ask for funds from the industry, and if they're successful, the government will grant additional money for the same purpose. In a single sentence, this transforms universities into project hunters.

This double-whammy is nothing short of injury and insult. On the one hand, the ‘industry’ will have the power to determine which courses get student grants. On the other hand, the same industry will have the power to determine which courses (and which universities) get additional funding.

The proponents of this NEPF seem to have worked under the assumption that Adam Smith’s invisible hand of the market will determine the optimal output. What they seem to have missed is that not all essential careers are in demand by the ‘market’, and Adam Smith’s invisible hand is not always benevolent. If we accept that the prime objective of privately owned, profit-oriented entities is to maximise profits, then we must compel ourselves to admit that they will only encourage careers that create a more malleable workforce but not encourage such careers (and education streams) that stand in the way of making more profits.

For example, under this NEPF, we can expect an increased influx of software engineers, textile engineers, and hospitality workers. However, we will not have as many human rights lawyers; labour lawyers; environmentalists; or climate scientists, for the simple reason that they are not ‘in demand’ by the market.

This level of blatant subjecting of the university education system to the wishes of privately owned, profit-oriented entities is simply unacceptable.

Student Loans – Repeating Raegen’s Failed Experiment

That the student loan system is a failure needs no elaboration: one only needs to have a cursory glance at the US education system to see where it has led. The issue of student loans is so pervasive that it has become one of the three main pillars of Joe Biden’s re-election campaign.

In the US, for example, Federal student loans were first offered in 1958 under the National Defence Education Act (NDEA), only to select categories of students, such as those studying engineering, science, or education. In the 65 years since American students owe USD 1.77 trillion in federal and private student loan debt as of the second quarter of 2023. As of 2023, student debt amounted to over 2.5% of the US nominal GDP. The average time for a US student to pay off their loans has grown from 10 years to well over 20 years¹.

The US is trying desperately to undo its mistake: the Biden administration, for example, has approved USD 146 billion cancellation of student loans for over 4 million students as of 2024 April.² While the largest nation to try out the experiment of student loans is now backpedalling and trying to rectify its grave mistake, we are actively advocating for ensnaring our student population.

It is worthwhile to note that the US student loan system was never meant to enable students as it claimed. In 1970, for example, Roger Freeman (then advisor to Raegen) is publicly quoted as saying, “We are in danger of producing an educated proletariat. That’s dynamite! We have to be selective on who we allow to go through higher education.”³ The current cry for ‘education reforms’ is eerily reminiscent of How Raegen began his attack on the public education system. For example, Raegen kept repeating that we must ‘clean up this mess’; the same sentiment is echoed in different words in the proposed NEPF. Change a phrase or two from Raegen’s statement⁴ from 1977 and it could well be Ranil’s address in 2024.

At least the Raegen administration was not hiding that they intended to subdue US student activism. Sri Lanka’s Ranil administration, however, is not so forthcoming. That Ranil loathes student activism in Sri Lanka begs no explanation. Since he took power in 2022, his unprecedented escalation of attacks on student freedom and activism has been well

documented. Given his ongoing bitter feud with student bodies and his public fascination with the neoliberal rhetoric of Reagan and Thatcher, one cannot disregard the proposed student loans as the perfect prison for student activism.

The immortal words of George Santayana 'Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it' ring true today just as much as they did in 1904.

1

<https://www.fool.com/student-loans/2023/08/01/the-average-borrower-takes-21-years-to-repay-their/>

2

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2024/04/08/president-joe-biden-outlines-new-plans-to-deliver-student-debt-relief-to-over-30-million-americans-under-the-biden-harris-administration/>

3 <https://theintercept.com/2022/08/25/student-loans-debt-reagan/>

4

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/speech/january-17-1967-statement-governor-ronald-reagan-tuition>

Robbing the Right to Dissent

Perhaps the less obvious but more insidious fact is that the proposed NEPF cannot be challenged in courts, by design. It is not a parliamentary act, it is a concept paper that is presented to the cabinet; as such, it cannot be taken to courts under Fundamental Rights.

Furthermore, the universities have had no say in this matter; they are simply given three years to comply. Any act of dissent is bound to be met with swift defunding.

Personally, the author of this document has publicly lamented the fact that we need only 150 men and women to cancel any human right in this country. As sensational as this may seem, it is indeed the truth. The parliament can propose any bill it wishes and make it into law, the only requirement is a 2/3 majority (which is 150 votes). Even if the said bill was in blatant violation of all known human rights, this would be the legal status. As extreme as this may sound, this is exactly how such draconian bills as the ICCPR, and the Online Safety Bill (OSB) were passed. Now, the Ranil administration has surpassed this and set a new bar by reducing the number of votes required to make a law to essentially zero. With exactly zero debate and votes, the NEPF has found itself upon us. The defiance of public rights here is truly appalling.

Conclusion

In light of the above matters, one cannot in good conscience stand to support the proposed NEPF. It cannot even be salvaged, for the obvious reason that its philosophy is not about giving free education. (The document is careful not to mention free education or education as a right.) It cannot be amended without a complete overhaul of the underlying principles on which it was composed.

The only recommendation this author can provide is to scrap the proposed NEPF in its entirety. If education reforms are to be enacted, they must take the form of a new proposal altogether, in an open forum with the participation of all stakeholders.

Chameera Dedduwage

2024.04.27

11. FUTA, April 26, 2024

<https://www.facebook.com/share/v/9sc7ZzM3KJqATUfd/?mibextid=qi2Omg>

<https://www.facebook.com/share/v/kRPrXipVFCuqR2ns/?mibextid=xfxF2i>

<https://www.facebook.com/share/v/o7k9Y6amYDX8qnFh/?mibextid=xfxF2i>

12. ජාතික අධ්‍යාපන පරිසර සංස්කරණ රාමුව හරිදේ වැරදිද?, ජනරජ කතිකා, May 02, 2024

<https://youtu.be/636eQ0HaWLc?si=dV46Ek7NLtjSJN5u>

<https://www.facebook.com/share/v/WaiUmuZ4egCnYKYr/?mibextid=xfxF2i>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tDEH-xkgPBc> (Ajith)

https://youtu.be/eWVYkWHb7il?si=arjRYxbVdlh5Np_9 (Sujata)

https://youtu.be/MSYynZLqbBU?si=z5KPHzhHt_ozN_rT (Nirmal)

13. අධ්‍යාපන පරිසර සංස්කරණ Monara TV, May 01, 2024

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tDEH-xkgPBc>

14. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපන කෝණාව , කුසල පරෙණේරු, May 05, 2015

<https://www.yukthiya.lk/?p=53395>; <https://theleader.lk/featured/23522-2024-05-05-09-48-15>

15. පොදුගිලික විශ්ව විද්‍යාල අවස්ථාද? Anuruddha Pradeep and Rohan Samarajiva, දකුණු ඉවුර, April 11

https://www.youtube.com/live/iIAuAb9mKYQ?si=r2VAPy_bjVvVchDU

16. වගේද්‍ර විද්‍යාල , රතනාන් සමරපිට, Ft.lk, april 19,

<https://theleader.lk/featured/23214-2024-04-19-11-40-38>

<https://www.ft.lk/columns/Broadening-medical-education-Who-s-paying-and-for-what/4-760700>

Sujata Gamage

BALPP

Lion's Activity center

University of Peradeniya,

Jana Rja Kathika, <https://www.facebook.com/share/v/WaiUmuZ4egCnYKYr/?mibextid=xfxF2i>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tDEH-xkgPBc> (Ajith)

https://youtu.be/eWVYkWHb7il?si=arjRYxbVdlh5Np_9 (Sujata)

https://youtu.be/MSYynZLqbBU?si=z5KPHzhHt_ozN_rT (Nirmal)

UMTA,