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 මූලගම ද?, March xx, University of Peradeniya, Part 01 1
3. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලගම ද?, April 06, University of Peradeniya, Part 02 1
4. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලගම ද?, April 18, Colombo Public Library 1
5. NEPF, April 21, National movement for Social Justice (NMSJ), Ajith Amarasinghe 2
6. ඉල්ලකය වරදවාගත්, අදම්වූ, අසම්පූර්ණ ලියවිල්ල, 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 ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණ රාමුව හරිද වැරදිද?, ජනරජ කතිකා, May 02, 2024 8
13. අධ්‍යාපන ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණ Monara TV, May 01, 2024 9
14. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපන **සෝෂාව ,** කුසල් පෙරේරා**, May 05, 2015** **9**
15. පෞද්ගලික විශ්ව විද්‍යාල අවශ්‍යද**? Anuruddha Pradeep and Rohan Samarajiva,** දකුණු ඉවුර**, April 11** **9**
16. වෛද්‍ය විද්‍යාල **,** රොහාන් සමරජීව**, 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=YJzosvef4cI

1. Dialogue on the National Education Policy Framework Jan 23, 2024, BALPP
https://t.co/zGb4Z31vMW
2. ප්‍රතිපත්ති හොඳයි. පරිවර්තන අවුල්. Sujata gamage
https://youtu.be/JmfwuVBF6Jg?si=zxAvZHMnnBaYuFpE
3. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලගම ද?, March xx, University of Peradeniya, Part 01
https://youtu.be/uhILIMeq-jQ?si=x5N04dcD9UDqzS5N

4. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලගම ද?, April 06, University of Peradeniya, Part 02
Sujata Gamage, Charitha Herath, Atulasiri Samarakoon,
https://youtu.be/RZwACxJK3iU?si=cTURmx5ITfR6r__t

5. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනයේ මූලගම ද?, April 18, Colombo Public Library
Dr. Pavithra Jayewardene, April 18, Colombo Public Library
නව අධ්‍යාපන ප්‍රතිපත්ති රාමුව ජනතාවට නිගරහයක්.ප්‍රතික්ෂේපි කරමු!
https://youtu.be/FWjo3b3axtw?si=cT1-XPymbkBhNpBg

රාජ්‍ය ව්‍යවසා ප්‍රතිව්‍යුහගත කිරීම ගැන දැනුවත් කරන්න සල්ලි තියනෙවා
13:17 නව ලිබරල් වාදී දෘෂ්ටි කෝණයකින් බංකු, එයාර්ලයින් හැකි ඉකමනින් මේවා පෞද්ගලීකරණය කරමු. ඒ සන්දර්භය ඇතුලේ තමයි මේ ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණ එන්නේ. අභිප්‍රාය අධ්‍යාපනයනේ බිහිවන අය හඳන්නේ ජයාතන්තර වලෙඳ පොලට. අපි ප්‍රධක්ව්ස හදනවා ජයාතන්තර වලෙඳ පොලට. අධ්‍යාපනය විකුනවා විතරක් නවෙයෙ ඒ ප්‍රධක්ට් එක හදන්නේ අපි වනුවනේ නොවෙයි. නිෂ්පාදන ආර්ථිකයකට
07:10 සිරියස් නැති ලියවිල්ලක්
පිටු 400 ක ගැඹුරු ලියවිල්ලක් තිබියදී ඒ ගැන සඳහනක් නැහැ.
Reference ලිස්ට් එජකක නැහැ.
Glossary එකක් නැහැ.
පරිවර්තනයේ ප්‍රශ්න තියනෙවා.
Revisit, Redefine, Optimize
ජයාත්තනතර ප්‍රමිති අනුව කියනවා - මොනවාද ඒ ප්‍රමිති කියන්නේ නැහැ.
අපට ඕනී ජයාත්තන්තර බල කේන්ද්‍ර වලට ඕනී හැටියට හැසිරනේනද?
අධ්‍යාපනයේ සියලු අංශ
අපේක්ෂිත පරිවර්තනිය වනෙස්කම් - විස්තර කිරීම් සමහර විට වගුවේ ඇති වාක්‍ය ඛණ්ඩයට වඩා කුඩායි.
නිර්‍රහයක්

14:00
කවුද හදපු එක්කනෝ
මතවාදය ප්‍රයෝගික වාදය; ඒකට අනු වනේන තරකයි.
ආර්ථික අර්බුදයේ වගකිම අධ්‍යාපනයට පවරනවා.
25 දනොගේ අධ්‍යපනිඥයන් නැතිවුනාට, නිර්දේශ කරනවා කිර්තිමත් අද්ස්පර්ශනයින්ගනේ සැලුම් ලත් උපදේශක මණ්ඩලයක්
තොරතුරු තාක්ෂණ උපදෙස් දනේන

20:15 විධායක සාරාංශය
" රාජ්‍ය පාසල් පද්ධතිය තුලින් ලබාදනෙ අධ්‍යාපන සේවාවන්හි දක්නට ලැබනෙ අනේකවිධ දුර්වලතාවයන්ට විසඳුම් ලසෙ කිසිදු නියාමනයකින් තොරව ක්‍රියාත්මක වමේන් පවතින වාණිජමය ස්වරූපයේ පෞද්ගලික අධ්‍යාපන ජාලයක් රට පුරා අතිශය අවිධිමත් අයුරින් නිර්මාණය වී ඇත."

විසඳුම් ලසෙ කියන්නේ:

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

අවසාන වශයනේ:
ජනතාවට කරපු නිර්‍රහයක්, විකුනන්න හදන්නේ අධ්‍යාපනයම පමණක් නොවෙයි. අපිව නැවත්ත යට විජිත සාමයේ තිබුණු ගැති තත්වයකට ගනෙියනවා.

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 මවෙනි ලියවිල්ලක දේශපාලන පක්ෂ වලින් සැලුණු කමිටුවක් මගින් නිර්මාණය විය යුතුයි.
5:00 නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපන සංකල්පය ගැන මුලිනිම සඳහනක් නැත.
6:40 සස්කරන්ය හරියට කරේ නැත. කරුණු අතත මතෙන.කරුණු කියවිලා නැහැ කියලා හිතනවා. බැලුවාම තව තැනක් තියනෙවා.

7:29 මධ්‍යාගත් /විමද්‍යගත කිරීම් සංකල්ප පැහැදිලි නැහැ
8:40 ස්වයං පාලන යෝජනාව / මූලයම ස්වාධීන මණ්ඩල හයනාකයි.
10:18 දුප්පත් පාසල් වලට
10:45 මුල් ළමා විය සංවර්ධනයේ පරෙ පාසල් නියාමනය ජාතික අධ්‍යප්පාන් ආයතනයට පැවරීම් හොඳයි.
12:40 ප්‍රාථමික අධ්‍යප්පත්‍යයේ ශිෂ්‍යත්ව විභාගය ගැන සඳහනක් නැහැ
14:10 කනිෂ්ඨ ද්විතියික අවධියේ විෂයන ගණන වැඩියි. ක්‍රීඩා අධ්‍යපනය ගැන නැහැ.
15:17 ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ ද්විතියික අධ්‍යාපනය
16:14 වැරදි ඉලක්කය .

7. ඉල්ලකය වරදවාගත්, අදම්වූ, අසම්පූර්ණ ලියවිල්ල, Anidda, April 22, 2024. Ajith Amarasinghe https://theleader.lk/featured/23263-2024-04-22-06-09-20

- සුජාත බව
- ආර්ථික ස්ථාවරත්වය වහාම ඇතිකර ගැනීමේ කඩිනම් වැඩපිළිවලෙකට සරිලන ලසෙ අධ්‍යාපනය වනෂ්ෙ කිරීමේ අභිලාශයනේ එය සකස්කොට ඇති බව නම් නොපෙනේ
- මුල් ළමාවිය සිට 12+ දක්වා පාසල් අධ්‍යාපනය සඳහා සිසුන්හට ගවේෂණ ඇති හැකියාවට කිසිදු බාධාවක් නොවන පරිදි අධ්‍යාපනය සඳහා වන රාජ්‍ය අරමුදල් සාමාන්‍ය අධ්‍යාපනය වතෙ යොමු කිරීමට ප්‍රමුඛතාවය ලබාදිය යුතුය. සිතාමතා මවෙනි වැරදි ප්‍රකාශයක් කිරීමනේම මේ ලියවිල්ලේ සැඟවුණු කතෘවරුන්ගේ අභිමතාර්ථය මුදල් ගවෙන සාමන්‍ය අධ්‍යාපනයකට මේ රට තුල මුල්තැන දීම බව පැහැදිලිය.
- මේ ලියවිල්ලේ විවිධ තැන්වල ඉස්මතු කරන අදහසක් නම් රජයට අධ්‍යාපනයේ මුළු බරපැන දැරිය නොහැකි නිසා අධ්‍යාපනයේ කොටසක් පුද්ගලික අංශයට භාරදිය යුතු බවයි. මේ තර්කය මුළුමනින්ම වැරදිය.
- හතු පිපනේනාක් මනේ බිහිවී ඇති ජාත්‍යන්තර පාසල් නමින් හඳුන්වන පාසල් 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 වශයනේ කලෙවර වනු ඇත්තේ මුල්‍යමය වශයනේ ස්වාධීන, සිසුන්ගනේ මුදල් අයකර ගන්නා ආයතන ලසෙිනි. මේ යෝජනාව ක්‍රියාත්මක වුවහොත් මේ රටේ අධ්‍යාපනය තෝරාගත් පිරිසකගේ මවෙලමක්ව පැවති කල තිබූ "පාසල් සමාගම්" යුගයකට අප රට ආපසු හැරී ගමන් කරනු ඇත.
- මුල් ළමා විය ආයතන අධීක්ෂණය සඳහා ඇති මුල් ළමාවිය සංවර්ධන ලේකම් කාර්යාලය ජාතික අධ්‍යාපන ආයතනය වතෙ අන්තර්ග්‍රහණය කිරීම මේ ලියවිල්ලේ ඇති වැදගත් යෝජනාවකි. මේ කාර්යාංශය ඉන්පසුව මේ ආයතනවල විෂය නිර්දේශ, ඉගැන්වීම අධීක්ෂණය කිරීම, පරෙ පාසල් ගුරුවරුන්ගේ පුහුණුව විධිමත් කිරීම වැනි දෑ සිදුකල යුතුය.
- මේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති රාමුවේ කිසිම තැනක පස්වැනි ශ්‍රේණියේ ශිෂ්‍යත්වය ගැන හෝ එය ප්‍රාථමික අධ්‍යාපනයට ඇතිකරන බලපෑම ගැන හෝ සඳහනක් නොකරයි.
- එක් විසඳුමක් නම් මේ විභාගය හත්වැනි ශ්‍රේණිය කල් දමා ජනප්‍රිය පාසල් වල පන්ති භයවැනි ශ්‍රේණියේදී නොව අටවනේ ශ්‍රේණියට පසුව පළල් කිරීමයි.
- භයවැනි ශ්‍රේණියේ සිට දහවනේ ශ්‍රේණිය දක්වා කාලය වන මයෙ මේ ලියවිල්ලේ අඩුම අවධානය යොමුකර ඇති කොටස වේ. වැදගත් අධ්‍යාපන අංශයක් වන "ක්‍රීඩා අධ්‍යාපනය " යන වචනය පවා පිටු 31 ක මේ ලියවිල්ලේ කොතැනක වත් සඳහන් නොවේ.
- ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ ද්විතියික හා ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවධිය: මේ අවධියන් පිලිබඳ මතෙනේ පලවූ ලියවිලි හෝ ක්‍රියාත්මක කල වැඩපිළිවලට අමතර කිසිදු නව කරුණක් මේ ලියවිල්ලේ අඩංගුව නැත. පාසලේ දරුවන් ගතකල යුතු වසර ගණන අඩු කිරීමට මේ ලියවිල්ලේ ඇති යෝජනාව හා අනකුත් යෝජනා මිට පරෙ කිහිප වතාවක් විවිධ ලියවිලිවල පැවසි තිබිණි.

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 සුරේන් රඹවන් උසස් අධ්‍යාපන රාජ්‍ය ඇමැතිත් මේක දන්නේ නැහැ කියනව
7:02 ජාතික අධ්‍යාපන කොමිසම් වාර්තාව ගැන සඳහනක් නැහැ
9:00 අධ්‍යාප්පන්ය පිළබඳ තනවුරු වී ඇති මූල ධර්ම)අධ්‍යප්පාන් අයිතිය) අහියෝගයට ලක් කරනවා
10:22 අධ්‍යාපනය වළෙඳපොල කරනය වලෝ. මේක අධ්‍යාපනය එය අනුව සකස් කරන්න හදනවා.
12:00 අධ්‍යපයේ අරමුණු ගැන සඳහනක් නැහැ.
13:00 රාජ්‍ය හා රාජ්‍ය නොවාන් ආයතන එක තලයකට ගනෙනෙවා
13:50 අධ්‍යාපනයත් ප්‍රවාහනය මනේ පුද්ගලිකව සපයාගන්න තත්වයකට එනවා. පොදු අධ්‍යප්පන්යේ

8. Nadeesh de Silva,OUSL මාධ්‍ය හමුව, April 22, කොළඹ විශ්වවිද්‍යාල ශාස්ත්‍රර 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 Reagen) 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 Reagen began his attack on the public education system. For example, Reagen 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 Reagen’s statement4 from 1977 and it could well be Ranil’s address in 2024.

At least the Reagen 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 Reagen 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 ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණ රාමුව හරිද 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/eWVYkWHb7iI?si=arjRYxbVdlh5Np_9 (Sujata)
https://youtu.be/MSYynZLqbBU?si=z5KPHzhHt_ozN_rT (Nirmal)

13. අධ්‍යාපන ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණ Monara TV, May 01, 2024
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tDEH-xkgPBc

14. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපන ඥෝෂාව , කුසල් පෙරේරා, May 05, 2015
https://www.yukthiya.lk/?p=53395; https://theleader.lk/featured/23522-2024-05-05-09-48-15

15. පෞද්ගලික විශ්ව විද්‍යාල අවශ්‍යද? Anuruddha Pradeep and Rohan Samarajiva, දකුණු ඉවුර, April 11
https://www.youtube.com/live/iIAuAb9mKYQ?si=r2VAPy_biJvVchDU

16. වෛද්‍ය විද්‍යාල , රොහාන් සමරජීව, 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/eWVYkWHb7iI?si=arjRYxbVdlh5Np_9 (Sujata)
https://youtu.be/MSYynZLqbBU?si=z5KPHzhHt_ozN_rT (Nirmal)

UMTA,