

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION :  
THEORETICAL POSTULATES  
AND RESEARCH PERSPECTIVE

---

- 1.1 Introduction
  - 1.2 The Statement of the Problem
  - 1.3 The Setting and the Perspective
  - 1.4 Review of Previous Research :  
The Problem and Its Neglect
  - 1.5 The Objectives of the Study
  - 1.6 The Scope and Delimitation of the Study
  - 1.7 The Sources of the Study
  - 1.8 The Research Questions
  - 1.9 The Conceptual Framework
  - 1.10 The Method and Procedure of the Study
  - 1.11 Chapterisation
  - 1.12 Conclusion
- Notes and References

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The major concern in the present doctoral study is to inquire into the relationship between the Central Government and the State Governments in India in the 'nodal' areas of educational finance and educational planning. This it seeks to do in the perspective of the Centre-State relations postulated in the constitutional provisions of the country. The constitution of India came into operation in 1950. Since 1951, operative relations in the administration of education have developed between the Government of India and the State Governments. The Indian federal polity has also been employing consultative devices, and mechanisms and strategies in policy-making in education with a view to making central decision-making in education acceptable to the States and creating the confidence among them that they are partners in the gigantic enterprise of education. But, the role of the "big brother" being assumed by the Centre in the field of education in an increasing degree in the last quarter of the century has created some concern (which is sometimes overtly expressed and sometimes only subtly conveyed) about the consequent disturbance in the balance of power in education between the Centre and the States.

The controversy between centralisation and decentralisation in education has, therefore, been gathering fire and also overtones of bitterness. The changing political situation in the country during the last decade and, particularly in the last couple of years, has brought Central-State relations and the controversy regarding centralisation and decentralisation again into sharper focus. The controversy, therefore, is still lively and is likely to be continuous and persistent. A research effort like the present one may yield some insights and directions for settling the controversy and provide a pointer to an amicable, and at the same time, productive solution of the problem of Centre-State relationship in education. The paucity of research efforts in this field and, especially in this direction gives a base, focus and urgency to attempts such as the present one. If education is to continue to receive a giant's share of national resources, financing and planning of education needs to be subjected to political and economic analysis. It is in such perspectives that the present study is undertaken.

## 1.2 THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of the study is worded as under :

"Centre-State Relations in Indian Education  
During The Four Plan Periods."

The term 'Centre' relates to the Government of India.

The term 'States' denotes the governments of The 22 States which constitute the Indian Union.

The term 'education' is used in the generalistic meaning not limited to any stage of instruction.

The 'Four Plan Periods' cover the period of twenty four years beginning with the First Five Year Plan in 1951 and ending with the conclusion of the Fourth Five Year Plan in 1974. The term is broadly used also to include the preliminaries of the preparation of the Fifth Five Year Plan in Education.

## 1.3 THE SETTING AND THE PERSPECTIVE

As the Indian state is constituted to-day, the government at the Centre has to find a modus vivendi with

more than a score of other governments - the governments in the States<sup>1</sup> - in the management<sup>2</sup> of education. Each of these States is armed with its own Constitutional jurisdictions, including, as it will be seen later in detail, almost exclusive jurisdiction over education; each one of them is also equipped with its own representative and other institutions for decision-making and decision-enforcement. The task of 'living together' that the Central Government thus faces in education is obviously not an easy one.

The issue involved here is, basically, that of centralisation versus decentralisation in education. There is a widespread feeling that while the founding-fathers of the constitution had deliberately opted for decentralisation<sup>3</sup> in education, the locus of 'educational sovereignty' has tended, through the post-independence years, to be the Centre. This has sometimes made the Centre the target of loud vituperation. But, more often, it has led to a demand for decentralisation and greater educational authority to the States. Some have even gone to the extent of recommending the abolition of the Ministry of Education at the Centre.\*

---

\* Such views appeared in the Indian press in articles and 'Readers' Views' columns in the sixties when Shri M.C. Chagla was the Union Education Minister.

3

The advocates of decentralisation base their case, in the main, on the cultural pluralism obtaining in the country<sup>4</sup> and the need for education to be close to the people. No political system, they argue, can function or even survive in the long run unless the prevalent political culture, of which institutional arrangements in education is an important component, takes full cognisance of the plurality of Indian culture. The 'minimal' and pre-democratic States of ancient and medieval times could perhaps overlook the divisive pulls of cultural diversity; or, in the alternative, they could overcome them through coercion. But, the modern state, particularly the one based on democratic value-premises, can manage cultural plurality only through devices of 'homogenisation'. These devices do indeed differ from State to State. But, the history of 'state-building' in recent times has shown that the internal cohesion of a State can be optimised under a federal system of decentralisation in which distinct cultural entities enjoy specific 'sub-system autonomy'.<sup>5</sup> Such autonomy is all the more essential in education which, by its very nature, should exist in a 'symbiotic' relationship with the people, and their needs and aspirations. In imposing its hegemony over the States in education,

therefore, the Centre does damage not only to the 'loyalty-  
-structure' of the State, but also to education.

The credibility of this case is strengthened by the fact that decentralisation has been an old and persistent theme in Indian public life.<sup>6</sup> The association of the concept with the Gandhian philosophy of a social order consisting of small scale and self-sufficient communities attracts to it the unquestioning allegiance of a large and sometimes influential section of the people.<sup>7</sup> The broad appeal of the concept also often makes it an easy gambit in populist politics.

Those who tend to look at post-independence developments in Centre-State relations in Indian education with equanimity belong to two distinct groups: (i) those who deny the allegation of Central hegemony over education; and (ii) those who accept that there has been a shift in educational authority to the Centre but consider this not only inevitable under the circumstances, but also perhaps desirable.

Central domination over Indian education is denied by the first group on the strength of the several cases of State recalcitrance to educational policies especially

canvassed by the Central Government. To the logically fastidious an argument of this kind may seem non sequitur, but it does indeed contain an element of truth. The latter fact has made it come in handy to those who plead for more powers to the Centre in education, including union ministers of education. <sup>Thus,</sup> concluding a series of proposals calculated to give more educational sinews to the Central Government, one Union Minister for Education complained to a national convention on Union-State relations:

Some years ago, the Government of India recommended, in the interest of national integration, that no state should impose any restriction on admissions to medical and engineering institutions on grounds of domicile and that admissions to these institutions should be open on equal terms, to all citizens of the country. But, inspite of protracted negotiations, it has not been possible to make the States agree to this suggestion. Every-one recognises the significance and importance of a vigorous implementation of the three-language formula at the school stage. But we have not been able to persuade the States to accept this. One State has refused to allow Hindi while some others are bent on eliminating English. In respect of text-books, complaints have often been received that some books used in some subjects contain material prejudicial to national integration or offend (sic)

some other State or part of the country. The need for creating an all-India Education Service has been largely recognised. But in spite of the efforts made by the Centre, the proposal has not become acceptable to the State Governments.<sup>8</sup>

The second group is more non-polemical in its approach. They seek an explanation - and also their justification - for the vertical shift in educational authority (which, as ~~we have~~ <sup>it has been</sup> seen, they do not attempt to deny) in modern 'growth theory'.

One of the widely accepted principles of growth theory to-day, this school rightly points out, is that 'social technology' is as important to growth as is 'material technology'.<sup>9</sup> The structure of the state and the dispersal of power along that structure are important components of social technology.<sup>10</sup> The choice in this dispersal of power as between centralisation and decentralisation is not completely open in situations of underdevelopment. In underdeveloped countries, the state is under strong compulsions - as can be seen from the history of the new states of the third world - to accept commitment to generating growth, and a high rate of growth as one of its major planks. This builds up pressures for centralised

decision-making. Growth itself, when it comes, reinforces the initial centralisation through the forces it inevitably lets loose. Centralisation thus is a pré-requisite of growth in underdeveloped countries; it is also a concomitant, and a result of growth almost universally. The trend towards centralisation is, therefore, a global one and is naturally in evidence also in education.

Even the 'classical' federations, including the United States of America, which has the strongest tradition of local control of education, are no exception to this. The centralising tendency in Indian education, therefore, is inherent in the situation and to deplore it is not to perceive its essential linkage with the socio-economic development of the country.

Not only this; centralisation in the final analysis is also beneficial to education. For one thing, it lifts education out of the reach of local and regional pressures which are often undemocratic and conservative.<sup>11</sup> Secondly, it also frees education from the constrictive tax base of the States. So went the argument of those who welcome the alleged centralising tendency currently in operation in Indian education.

It is true that the controversy regarding Centre-State relations in education has not been as acrimonious as in some other sectors of governmental activity for reasons that are not far to seek. It has, however, been equally persistent. There is hardly a major Commission or Committee in education appointed after independence which was not seized of the problem or some aspect of it. As early as 1949, the University Education Commission had touched upon it in relation to the field of higher education and recommended that university education be placed on the concurrent list of legislation.<sup>12</sup> Hardly four years had passed after this when the Secondary Education Commission (1952-53) reverted to the question and expressed the view that the Centre is not absolved of all responsibility in regard to secondary education and that in all matters connected with the improvement of secondary education, there should be the fullest cooperation between the States and the Centre.<sup>13</sup> The latest in this line of authoritative bodies has been the Education Commission (1964-66) headed by Prof. D. S. Kothari. This Commission considered the question important enough to examine it at some length. It came to the conclusion that in a vast country like ours, the position given to education in the Constitution is 'probably the best'.<sup>14</sup>

The concern about Centre-State relations in education has not been confined to official bodies making ex cathedra policy pronouncements on education. There is no professional organisation of teachers in the country which has not taken a stand on the issue.<sup>15</sup> The latest instance is that of the newly-formed organisation of Education for Secularism, Socialism and Democracy. In its first conference itself held in September last at the exclusive Vigyan Bhawan in New Delhi and inaugurated by the Prime Minister, the ESSD came out with a statement which demanded that suitable amendments be made to the Constitution 'to declare higher education as a concurrent subject in order to help the growth of a national accountability and a national outlook in higher education'.<sup>16</sup> From all accounts, the conference confined its recommendation to higher education only because it was reminded by the sponsors that the ESSD represented only college and university teachers.

While on the one side official commissions and committees in education and professional organisations of teachers have been pleading for greater involvement of the Centre in education, on the other, the allegation has been mounting, particularly among private scholars, that the Centre has overstepped its brief in education. From the point of view

---

of the study of Centre-State relations, the nineteen-sixties was remarkable, for, the decade saw the publication of a number of competent studies of the problem.<sup>17</sup> None of these studies confined its attention to education, but almost all of them had occasion to refer to the field and the increasing Central control over it. Santhanam, whose study was perhaps the first in the series and set the tone for the rest, cited at some length examples from the field of primary education and concluded :

The only point I wish to make here is that, even in such a thing as primary education, a uniform policy throughout the country has been sought to be enforced and a uniform change of policy has been equally imposed.<sup>18</sup>

It, however, fell to the lot of the Administrative Reforms Commission, as we shall have occasion to see in the course of this study, to put the seal of authenticity on the allegation of central domination over Indian education.

1.4 REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH :  
THE PROBLEM AND ITS NEGLECT

The voices that make the allegation have only become louder since then. Yet, there has been no research attempt at an objective scrutiny of the allegation. Its veracity is either accepted unquestioningly or rejected out of hand. The contenders in the controversy regarding centralisation versus decentralisation generally move in the ratified realm of theory; their moorings in operative relationships between the Centre and the States are extremely tenuous.

The paucity of research in the field is not entirely surprising, because Centre-State relations in functional areas like industry, agriculture, irrigation, power, health and education, which are largely fields within the sphere of the states, but in which the Centre has begun to play an increasingly important role, have not received the attention they deserve.<sup>19</sup> A recent research survey<sup>20</sup> sponsored by the Indian Council of Social Science Research lists only less than a dozen papers and articles, and three full-fledged studies in the area. The survey does not claim to be exhaustive; yet it is certainly indicative of the dearth of research in the field.

The poverty—there is no other word that describes the situation adequately — of research in the area of Centre - State relations in education strikes one almost in the eye. Among the nine papers listed in the survey in this field, not one is related to education. One of the three full-fledged studies, however, is J.P. Naik's Educational Planning in India (1965).<sup>20</sup> This would certainly have been some satisfaction but for the fact that there seems to be a gross error of judgement here. For, though the work bears ample evidence of Naik's exceptionally high level participation in fashioning the educational policy of the country, even a cursory examination should show that it is hardly a study of Centre-State relations in education. The entire focus is different; the Centre-State relations come in only incidentally and marginally.

Naik, however, has to his credit contributions more specifically related to the Centre-State relations in education that the survey has unfortunately missed. It may not be out of place here to take a quick look at these and other meagre literature available in the area.

Naik's widely read paper, "The Role of the Government of India in Education,"<sup>21</sup> was the first ever attempt at a

coherent statement of the problems and broad facts connected with the Centre-State relations in education. The paper approached the problem from three angles: historical, constitutional and comparative. Given this framework, it was natural that the paper was primarily concerned with the static rather than the dynamic aspects of Centre-State relations. There was, however, a brief reference to operative Centre-State relationships in the context of three 'significant developments': (i) 'the growing desire to evolve a national system of education for the country as a whole'; (ii) 'revival of Central grants for education'; and (iii) 'the adoption of centralised planning and the creation of the Planning Commission'.<sup>22</sup> After an all too succinct and broad statement of these developments, Naik came to the conclusion :

"It will thus be seen that the inherent contradiction in the constitutional position has been still further accentuated by the developments of the last ten years and the role of the Centre has now become far more important in actual practice than the cold print of the Constitution".<sup>23</sup>

It is no carping criticism, however, to point out that this conclusion was based more on Naik's inside knowledge of the process of policy-making in Indian education than

any detailed analysis of the mechanics of operation of the three developments to which Naik had rightly drawn attention. For, there was little researching in evidence in the paper into operative relationships. If the paper showed signs of any research effort, it was generally limited to the historical and the comparative parts of the study. Naturally so perhaps, for, when Naik made this pioneer effort, the Indian constitution was hardly in operation for ten years.

The purpose of Naik's more recent contribution to the study of Centre-State relations, <sup>in education,</sup> a paper entitled "Union-State Relations in Education: their implications for Educational Administration"<sup>24</sup> was explicitly not research. The paper, contributed to a special number of the Indian Journal of Public Administration on the administrative aspects of Union-State relations was mainly policy-oriented. Written after the political developments of 1967, the paper was based on the assumption that the 'extraneous considerations' that had made for the centralising tendency in education had disappeared and the country was 'now called upon to administer education, for the first time, in the literal spirit of the Constitution'.<sup>25</sup> The paper then proceeded to discuss the administrative aspects of the problems that

would attend efforts 'to rebuild' Centre-State relations in education in this direction.

Though opinion on the various suggestions made in the paper would differ, there was no doubt that Naik's second paper fulfilled admirably the modest task it had set itself. The task, however, was not description; the task, by design, was prescription.

To this category of the prescriptive and hortatory also belong two other pieces of writing in the field. A reference was made earlier, in a different context, to a paper by V.K.R.V. Rao presented to the 1970 National Convention on Union-State Relations. The other, again a paper, by Surendranath Panda<sup>26</sup> is similar in purpose, but lacks, unlike Rao's paper, a coherent conceptual framework. Both Rao and Panda seem to be highly indebted to Naik (particularly his first paper) though the debt is not acknowledged. What is relevant to the present discussion, however, is the fact that neither of the two papers makes any research contribution to the area of Centre-State relations in education. Nor was it their intention to do so.

Educational Planning: Its Legal and Constitutional Implications in India<sup>27</sup> is a collection of the papers

presented at a seminar organised at Delhi in January 1966 under the joint auspices of the Indian Law Institute and the Education Commission (1964-66). The purpose of the seminar was 'to provide an opportunity for a realistic assessment of the widely held feeling among intellectuals in India that the law and the Constitution presented obstacles to (the) implementation of educational plans'. It also discussed the important question of 'the extent to which educational planning could be centrally guided'.<sup>28</sup>

It will not be reasonable to look for a common angle or uniform quality in a collection like this. But, if the papers are any indication, the seminar seems to have done justice to its theme within the generally known limitations of any gathering of intellectuals like this. Considerable research and study seems to have gone into the preparation of several of the papers. The weakness of the collection from our point of view is, however, reflected in the academic background of the contributors of the papers. Though the editor in his introductory note claims that the seminar was an inter-disciplinary venture, 14 out of the 18 contributors are well-known jurists, <sup>of repute</sup> mostly professors of law. It is, therefore, not surprising that the collection, if it is to be classified, belongs to the well-known genre of

legal treatises like those of Seervai (Constitutional Law of India, 1969), Basu (Commentaries on the Constitution of India, 1965) and others, though the focus here is limited to education and educational planning in particular. Even the papers of the four non-jurist contributors seem to have been influenced by the orientation of the other papers. The collection taken together, therefore, is descriptive and analytical and deal with operative relationships, as in the case of Naik's paper on the role of the Government of India in education, only peripherally.<sup>29</sup>

There is thus a serious research gap in the area of Centre-State relations in education. The few studies that exist such as they are, deal either with the historical, legal and static aspects of the problem or, are little more than policy-oriented pronouncements. Operative relationships between the Centre and the States in education largely remain a neglected and unexplored area of study.

The reasons for this neglect are not far to seek. One such reason could be the lack of 'models'. Research students know well the important role model studies play in social sciences in suggesting research areas and themes to would-be researchers. But in the present case, though such models have

not been as abundant as in some other areas, they have not been entirely lacking. As early as 1950, when the Indian Constitution came into operation, there was available a major study of the role of the federal government in American education. The study made by Hollis P. Allen for the Hoover Commission Task Force on Public Welfare<sup>30</sup> was necessarily descriptive and sought to identify, historically and currently, federal policies in education in the United States. Within four years, towards the close of the first Five Year Plan in India, was published another study in the United States, which in many ways marks a definite advance on Allen's rather descriptive exercise. This study by Dawson Hales<sup>31</sup> sought, primarily, to evaluate the principle of local sovereignty in education. But, in doing so, the study made a departure from current academic practice in not confining its attention to educational institutions and the democratic faith alone. The basic assumption of the study was that education was a function of the society in which it operated and, therefore, an attempt to evaluate any method of regulating it should consider changes in basic forces, relationships and trends in society. The principle of local control is then identified as a function of the society and culture of the period (1830-1850)

prior to the full upsurge of the industrial revolution. The changes in the principle and the entry of the federal government into education is seen in the background of the social forces that had come into operation during 1930 to 1950.

The research trail blazed by Allen and Hales has been followed by other scholars after them. Competent studies in the field are many now, not only in the American context, but in the context of other federal polities also.<sup>32</sup>

Thus, the blame for the relative neglect of the problem of Centre-State relations in Indian education cannot be laid upon the subjective factor of the lack of a research tradition in the area. Other subjective factors, more of an indigenous nature, cannot, however, be so easily exonerated. The most important among them may be the traditional 'political myopia'<sup>33</sup> of the Indian student of education. For various reasons, mostly historical, Indian educationists have been particularly blind to the political process. The political process, and the students of that process have been equally blind to them, in turn, but for a slightly different reason; the peripheral importance of education so far (all protests to the contrary notwithstanding) to the affairs of the nation.

There, however, is an objective and more immediate reason for the meagreness of research attention paid to Centre-State relations in education. A full-fledged federal system of government has been in operation in this country only since the fifties. No assessment of the actual working of the system in education could perhaps be meaningfully undertaken before the system had operated for some time. Unfortunately also the operative relations between the Centre and States (particularly in education, where antecedent agreement on policies existed in a larger measure than in other areas) were obscured by various 'extraneous' factors including the oft-lamented, 'one party rule' and the charisma of the early policy-makers at the Centre.<sup>34</sup>

With the completion of the Fourth Five Year Plan, the Indian federal system had been in operation for nearly a quarter of a century. This is long enough for any system of government to show up its weaknesses and strengths. It may not be, therefore, premature at this juncture to make an attempt to fill the research gap in the area of Centre-State relations in education. The present study is a very modest effort in this direction.

It may not be out of place to add here that such an effort will also be in line with a broad and welcome trend

of recent origin in the field of education which promises to make amends for the serious academic omission referred to a short while ago. Education consumes a giant's share of the resources of the nation; yet, as seen earlier, it has until recently received little political analysis. Now, however, the political aspects of education seem to be increasingly engaging the interest of not only professional educators, but also political scientists and sociologists.<sup>35</sup>

#### 1.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

As stated earlier, the major purpose of the present study is to examine critically Centre-State relationship in the financing and planning of education in the country. In the perspective of this broad, central purpose, some specific objectives could be specified.

- (1) To examine critically the historical background of Centre-State relations in education over a period of time with a view to developing a perspective on and an insight into the antecedents of the traditions set in this field;

- (2) To identify bases of relationship in education established between the Centre and States in the Constitutional provisions;
- (3) To get acquainted with and assess the effectiveness of the Centre-State Consultative Machinery in education in respect of financing and planning;
- (4) To inquire into the effect of financial inputs in education through the operational Union-State financial relationship existing in education;
- (5) To examine planning in the Indian Constitution and assess the operational Central-State relationship in educational planning as reflected in the current process and practices of educational planning in the country.

These are the major five objectives of the present study.

#### 1.6 SCOPE AND DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The scope of the present study is the Centre-State relationship in the financing of <sup>education</sup> and educational planning during the period of the first four Five Year Plans in education. This relationship is perceived largely from

the point of view of its Constitutional bases. To a limited extent the scope is also comparative in the sense that the study makes use of practices and operational experiences in regard to Centre-State relations in the domain of education in some other countries. The financial relationships pertain largely to the financial resources of the Federal Government and those of the federating States, signifying fiscal dyarchy. The basis of viewing Centre-State relationship in educational planning are legal, political and educational.

Problems of delimitation arise here. The superstructure of operative Centre-State relations in education, built up on the constitutional base, 'straddle' over a vast and unwieldy area. They cover the entire gamut of programmes, activities and levels in education. It is patently impossible to deal with this 'impacted area' (to use a rather ungrammatical jargon) in its entirety in any single study. An obvious way out was to delimit the study of the 'superstructure' to one single level or selected levels of education, or, in the alternative, to some programmes or functions in education. However, to confine the study of the superstructure to one level or selected levels of education, or, for that matter, to some programmes would have been inconsistent with the

macro-analysis the researcher had opted for. It was, therefore, decided to delimit this part of the study to two governmental functions in education, namely, financing and planning. It will be seen that the study also takes a quick look at some federal devices of federal decision-making and Consultation. This seemed to be a logical corollary of the major delimitation.

No apology is perhaps needed for the choice of financing and planning as the main focus of the study at the level of the superstructure of operative relations. Their importance is patent. They constitute 'nodal' functions in the sense in which the Study Team of the Administrative Reforms Commission on the Machinery of the Government of India, in a similar context, has used that expression.<sup>36</sup> Their impact is all pervasive and more often than not, this impact has a determinative weight on what happens in education. The fact that they also constitute the most proliferating of the governmental functions in education the world over and particularly in the developing countries, only adds to their significance.

The temporal delimitation of the study posed no serious problem, There were only two over-riding considerations here. Firstly, the span of time chosen must be adequate

enough for an identifiable 'superstructure' of <sup>operative</sup> Centre-State relations in education to have been built up over the Constitutional 'base'. Secondly, the period chosen should include the years of crisis of the 'sixties when the 'durational expectancy' of the Indian federation had reached its lowest ebb. It is generally claimed that the general elections of 1967 brought about climacteric changes in the configuration of Centre-State relations which posed an outright challenge to the basic frame of Indian federation.<sup>37</sup> These considerations almost inevitably led to the choice of the period of time covered by the Four Five Year Plans (1951-1974) as the main temporal focus for the study, though this need not stop one from drawing some of the illustrations of a secondary and on-going nature from the current Fifth Plan. Happily, the period of 1951-1974 also includes the initial years of, what some scholars have called, 'the re-stabilization of the Indian political system'.<sup>38</sup>

#### 1.7 THE SOURCES OF THE STUDY

As to the data base of the study, the primary sources consisted mainly of reports. The most important among them were :

- (1) Reports of the Constituent Assembly and Lok Sabha debates;
- (2) Reports of official commissions and committees on education;
- (3) Reports of official Commissions and committees on Centre-State relations, finance, planning and related matters. These also included reports of some such commissions and committees appointed by State Governments;
- (4) Reports of statutory commissions like the Finance Commission;
- (5) Annual and other periodical reports of the Union Ministry of Education including the series of statistical compilations periodically published by that ministry;
- (6) Reserve Bank Bulletins and reports;
- (7) Reports of official conventions, conferences, seminars and workshops on centre-State relations, planning, finance and related matters; and
- (8) Newspaper reports on relevant matters relating to the period under study.

To the primary sources may also be added some archival material that were used, particularly in the preparation of the historical chapter. But recourse to the archives was

made mostly unnecessary by the fact that the relevant historical documents were largely available in published selections from educational records.

Secondary sources consisted mainly of published books, research papers, articles and reports of non-official conventions, conferences and seminars.

While the above were sources that were available for formal documentation of the study, there were three other sources that greatly augmented the investigator's understanding of the problem, such as it is. These were :

(1) Records of the Union Ministry of Education and the Planning Commission: Official permission had been sought for the use of the records of the Ministry of Education for the purposes of the study. It was not formally refused; but, the 'dangers' involved in granting the permission was informally explained to the investigator at the highest level.<sup>39</sup>

But, because of the association of the investigator with the Ministry, for some three years in the recent past, he had easy, though informal, access to many current and some recorded files of the Ministry. He had also informal access to some files and other records of the Planning Commission.

He was, however, not free to quote or reproduce from these except in the case of statistics that are usually published.

(2) 'Observation' of Plan discussion: The National Development Council discussions and State Plan discussions are considered extremely confidential both by the Union Ministry of Education and the Planning Commission.<sup>40</sup> The present investigator, however, was able to sit through the plan discussions relating to the two states during the year 1968, informally.

(3) Discussions with state government officers and with officers of the Union Ministry of Education and the Planning Commission: During his association with the Union Ministry of Education, the investigator had had many occasions for discussion of the present problem with high-ranking state government officers. These occasions were deliberately looked for and made use of by the investigator, but State Government officers, except in a handful of cases, did not know of the research interest of the investigator in the topic. The officers with whom he was able to have discussions belonged to almost all states, but due to some fortuitous factors not connected with this study, discussions were more numerous with officers from Kerala, Madras, Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh.

The investigator also has had many discussions on the problem with several high ranking officers of the Union Ministry of Education and the Planning Commission. Unlike in the case of State Government officers, most of the Central officers with whom he had discussions knew of the research interest of the investigator in the topic.

#### 1.8 THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

There perhaps remain only two more matters that need to be touched upon here, namely, the research objectives of the study and its methodology and procedures.

The foregoing discussion should give some broad idea regarding the purpose of the study. The study seeks mainly to answer the following questions :

- (1) What is the nature of Centre-State relations visualised in the Constitution? What are the constitutional provisions in this regard?
- (2) What operative relations between the Centre and the States have been developed in the field of education during 1951 to 1974?
- (3) What operative relationships have been developed in

particular in the 'nodal' areas of finance and planning?

- (4) What are the major policy-making and consultative devices developed by the Indian federal polity for decision-making in education? How do they operate?
- (5) What, finally, is the 'balance of power' between the Centre and the States in education as it has developed through the years under study?
- (6) What are the policy implications of the findings with regard to the above questions?

These research questions would form the basis and they will constitute a reference frame of the present study.

### 1.9 THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

It is with some diffidence that a 'conceptual framework' is incorporated here. This diffidence needs explanation.

The 'ethos' of social sciences, like that of natural sciences - its paradigm - is the search for 'objective' truth. 'Objectivity' in the pure sense of that term, that is, in the sense in which it refers to 'a data gathering situation where an observation does not depend on the

peculiarities of the observer!<sup>41</sup> is impossible of achievement in social research. There is an element of bias in all research in social sciences. As Myrdal puts it :

There is an inescapable a priori element in all scientific work. Questions must be asked before answers can be given. The questions are all expressions of interest in the world; they are at bottom valuations. Valuations are thus necessarily involved already at the stage when we observe facts and carry on theoretical analysis, and not only at the stage when we draw... inferences.<sup>42</sup>

This problem has been of much concern to social scientists in recent times. The solution suggested is: 'raise the valuations actually determining our theoretical as well as our practical research to full awareness.'<sup>43</sup>

The 'conceptual framework' here is meant to be an exercise on these lines. The initial diffidence in its incorporation was occasioned by the fact that though the malady is widely recognised, the remedy is less generally accepted. What has helped in overcoming it is the reassuring thought that if the remedy is not efficacious, it can not be pernicious either.

Before the propositions that constitute the conceptual framework are specified, it must be stated that each one of the individual propositions here may not possess separate analytical relevance.<sup>44</sup> The framework is like a lens through which facts for study are identified and then seen; and, like a lens it works better when it is in one piece.

The propositions are :-

- (1) The educational system in India is a subsystem of Indian society and should, therefore, serve the needs of the latter.
- (2) 'Needs' here means not only 'necessary conditions of existence' in the tradition of Radcliffe-Brown and the functionalists,<sup>44</sup> but also necessary conditions of progress towards a normative society.
- (3) The nature of this normative society is broadly defined in the Indian Constitution and amplified in policy resolutions of the Indian parliament, such as the resolution on the socialistic pattern of society.
- (4) The necessary conditions of existence of Indian society, and its progress towards the accepted normative society are also broadly visualised in the Indian constitution and these policy resolutions.

- (5) One of the necessary conditions so visualised is greater 'homogenisation' among the people of India which is a highly plural society.
- (6) This homogenisation is sought to be achieved, basically, through the federal system of decentralisation in which distinct socio-cultural entities enjoy sub-system autonomy.
- (7) The formal regulatory arrangements of education envisaged under this federal system are founded on the 'needs' of Indian society as they were perceived by the framers of the Indian constitution.
- (8) The needs of Indian society are, therefore, primary and the regulatory arrangements of education secondary.
- (9) These regulatory arrangements cannot, thus, claim any finality and can be altered, if the needs of Indian society are seen to demand such alterations.<sup>45</sup>

These propositions obviously are not exhaustive. Many more assumptions than these are perhaps implicitly in the study. In most cases, however, they are likely to be found either to be extensions of the ones listed here or their corollaries.

## 1.10 THE METHOD AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

### (a) Nature of the Study

What was said a little while ago about the emerging Trend of subjecting education to political analysis and the present study conforming to this trend seems to make it necessary to preface this section with a partial disclaimer. The statement may be interpreted to mean that this study is an exercise in political analysis. 'Politics' unfortunately is a smear word. It is in the Lasswellian sense of 'power maneuvering',<sup>46</sup> with all its attendant unflattering associations, that the word is to-day used in common parlance. The present study is certainly not related to politics or the politics of education for that matter, in this entirely un-Hellenic sense of the word. The word however is also used, in political science, with greater discrimination and more in tune with the pristine Greek tradition in its usage. In this use of the word, 'policy-making' is one of the basic frames of reference in politics and the political process is defined, as Toby does, as 'the policy-making mechanism of interactive systems.'<sup>47</sup> In this rather broad sense of the word, the study is indeed concerned with political analysis. It is, however, realised that this is not to say much. In a way it is not more than a tautology for saying that the study falls within the traditional boundaries of the field of administration which, in any case, is only obvious. The disclaimer may, however, discourage expectations that may not be fulfilled by the study.

also  
It may be appropriate to mention here  
that the present study is exploratory in nature. The word 'exploratory' is used not only in its ordinary dictionary sense, but also in the special sense in which some scholars have used it to designate a study of this kind.<sup>48</sup> An exploration, in the dictionary meaning, is something of an adventure - an attempt to probe, in a tentative way, some unknown, neglected but nevertheless promising area. By the same token, an exploratory study is research designed, hopefully, to generate hypotheses, not to test them. Such a study seeks to provide the rationale which will justify future research aimed at testing hypotheses.

(b) The Methodological Option

Clearly, the first and perhaps the most difficult problem that an exploratory study of this kind faces is that of methodological option. For, exploration is possible both through case study and aggregate analysis techniques. Both techniques have their limitations. The limitations of the case study are those of the proverbial philosopher who seeks to understand the universe by reflection upon a pebble. The dangers of his missing the relationships between the many pebbles, the pebbles and the shore, the shore and the wind, and finally, the latter and the waves, and indeed, these

relationships within the totality of their ecology are quite real.<sup>49</sup> The limitations of aggregate analysis are equally serious. These arise from the problems of validation and reliability. Does the grossness of the measure aggregated encompass the important, but subtle aspects of the relationship studied? Thus, if one measures the movement of the Centre into education in a federal polity only by the quantum of educational expenditure borne by it, he may not be necessarily 'measuring' the balance of power in educational decision-making between the Centre and the States.

The methodological option made here is deliberately and explicitly in favour of aggregate analysis. This choice has been, in the main, an arbitrary one; but it is not entirely beyond or without justification. The history of the development of disciplines itself suggests one justification; the hypothesis of the primacy of 'gestalts' ('organised wholes') in the operations of the mind indicates another. It is not, however, necessary here to expatiate upon any one of these. It should be enough to say that a preliminary probe into the entire area of Centre-State relations in education (a 'holistic' approach) seemed to be a better prelude to more intensive studies - including case studies of different aspects or discrete instances - of the problem.

Such a probe, as has been suggested by a perspicacious student of Centre-State relations, is best undertaken at two levels.<sup>50</sup> For the lack of more appropriate words, these levels may be designated as the 'base' and the 'superstructure' levels.

If it is agreed to keep in abeyance the Marxist connotation of the words base and superstructure in the present discussion, the base of Centre-State relations in education as has been implied earlier will consist, in the explicit provisions of the Constitution regarding education, in conjunction with the assumptions underlying these provisions.<sup>51</sup> The base level study, therefore, will be in the main concerned with these provisions, and the assumptions implicit in them as reflected, in the present study, in the current legal view of these provisions.

But, if the study is confined to this, it will only give a rather anaemic understanding of the educational provisions of the Constitution. The socio-political values embodied in these provisions have evolved in history, as components of a response to certain historical imperatives. An understanding of these imperatives will heighten our understanding of the provisions themselves. Thus the study of the Constitutional provisions will be set against a

necessarily brief historical survey of some of these imperatives.

Upon the base of the Constitutional provisions regarding education, a 'superstructure' of functions and operative relations have been built up during the past several years. The second level of study is concerned with this superstructure.

#### 1.11 CHAPTERISATION

The thesis will consist of seven chapters :

Chapter I is introductory and provides a broad profile of the study. It presents the setting and perspectives of the problem and the basic postulates relating to the study. It also attempts a brief review of previous research or studies relating to Centre-State relations in education in the context of both India and the U.S.A. It then briefly sets forth the research design in terms of specific objectives, sources of data, the scope and delimitation of the study, the method and procedures adopted in analysing and interpreting the collected data, the research questions, and the conceptual framework.

The evolution and historical development of Centre-State relations in Indian education during the pre-plan period of 1813-1950 are critically examined in Chapter II.

Chapter III presents a short chronicle of Constitutional developments during the early decades of the century so as to bring out the emergence and growth of the federal idea in India and its final consummation in the present constitution. It then discusses the constitutional basis of current Centre-State relations in Indian education. It examines the structural relationships in the Indian Constitution between the Federal Government and its constituent units. It attempts to clarify first the term 'federal' based on support from several constitutional authorities, and then goes on to examine the formal arrangements in the Constitution regarding "education". A brief survey of the constitutional position of education in some other federalism provides a comparative perspective.

Centre-State financial relations in education form the field of critical examination and discussion in Chapter IV. Questions such as transfer of resources, the instrumentality of the Finance Commission, the increasing dependence of States on the Centre for financial resources for education, the logic of Centrally-sponsored schemes and Centrally assisted schemes in educational plans, etc. will be subjected to a searching examination in this chapter.

Chapter V will be devoted to a critical examination and evaluation of the nature and scope of Centre-State relations in educational planning.

The Centre-State consultative machinery in education will form the theme of Chapter VI. It will attempt to examine the case for consultation, will review experiences in this regard elsewhere, and seeks to give a close and inquiring look at the operation of the National Development Council (the NDC), the Central Advisory Board of Education (the CABE), and the Conference of State Education Ministers (the CSSEM).

Chapter VII will be the final concluding chapter. It reviews the content and the focal points of the earlier chapters of the study, notes pertinent conclusions and suggests a possible direction and dimension to attack realistically and fruitfully the problem of Centre-State relationship in "Education".

#### 1.12 CONCLUSION

Such is broadly the research plan of the present study. It is both descriptive and analytical or interpretative. It draws considerably from constitutional history

and political analyses of the structures and the operation of the principal agencies of education. In the course of such an exercise of legal, political and educational analysis, it examines some major concepts and doctrines of educational administration that have a vital bearing on financing and planning of Indian education at the Central and State levels.

The next chapter will be devoted to an examination of the historical development of Centre-State relations in education during the British rule in India.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. With the entry of Sikkim, there are 22 States in the Indian Union now. In the present study the Union Territories are not taken into consideration.
2. The word is used here in its widest sense - in the sense in which Oliver Sheldon used the word in his The Philosophy of Management. See Albert Lapawsky, Administration: The Art and Science of Organisation and Management, Calcutta (Indian Edition), Oxford and IBH Publishing Co., p.37.
3. In the parlance of political science, centralisation and decentralisation are applied sometimes to the relations between different levels of a government and at others, to the relations between higher and lower authorities in a single level of government. Sir Charles Harris makes a distinction between these two sets of relations and reserves the term 'decentralisation' to the second set of relations. See Truman D. Bicknell, Administrative Decentralisation, 1952, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, p.24.
4. P.C. Mathur, "Future Prospects", Seminar, No.156, August 1972, p.38.
5. Ibid.
6. It has been so in most 'New States' Myrdal<sup>6</sup> has pointed out that in the whole of South Asia decentralisation<sup>7</sup> is a 'more widely accepted valuation than any of the modernisation ideals other than the quest for independence'. See Gunnar Myrdal, Asian Drama : An Enquiry into the Poverty of Nations (abridged edition), 1972, London, Allen Lane the Penguin Press, p.35.

7. This is so in spite of the fact that the Gandhian concept of decentralisation was very different in its content. Gandhiji's criticism of the Indian Constitution was: "The centre of power was in New Delhi, or in Calcutta and Bombay, in the big cities. I would have it distributed among the seven hundred thousand villages in India". The fate of proposals made by <sup>the</sup> Balwantraoi Mehta Committee (1957) is ample evidence of the meagre support this ideal of decentralisation enjoys among the political elite in India to-day. Article 40 of the Constitution which enjoins on the country Panchayati Raj as one of the directive principles of state policy now stands, basically, as nothing more than a token acknowledgement of her indebtedness to the Father of the Nation.
8. V.K.R.V. Rao, the then Union Minister for Education, at the National Convention <sup>on</sup> Union-State Relations held in April 1970 at New Delhi. See V.K.R.V. Rao, "Centre-State Relations in Education", in S.N. Jain et al (ed.), The Union and the States, 1972, Delhi, National, pp.184-5.
9. There is a growing literature here on which the school can base itself in this part of their argument. The work of 'theory-builders' like Gabriel A. Almond and David E. Apter are basic and are well-known. There is also a large number of studies using, often implicitly, the conceptual framework advanced by these pioneers. Two works of this kind chosen at random are: Robert T. Holt and John E. Turner, The Political Basis of Economic Development: An Exploration in Comparative Political Analysis, 1970 (Indian Edition), New Delhi, Affiliated East-West Press Pvt. Ltd., and Eugene Staley, The Future of Underdeveloped Countries: Political Implications of Economic Development, 1963, London, Frederick A. Praeger.

10. For an explanation of the terms 'social technology' and 'material technology', see Eugene Staley, Op.cit., pp.211-12.
11. For one instance of argument on these lines, see S.K.Arora and P.J. Arora, "Some Theoretical Considerations on Tension-Management in Federal Politics", a paper presented at the Seminar on Union-State Relations in India sponsored by the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla and held at Simla in May 1969 (Type-script).
12. Government of India, The Report of the University Education Commission (1948-1949), p.435.
13. Ministry of Education, Government of India, Report of the Secondary Education Commission, p.169.
14. Ministry of Education, Government of India, Report of the Education Commission (1964-66): Education and National Development, p.451.
15. See V.K.R.V. Rao, Op.cit., p.180.
16. "Statement of the Conference of Educators for Secularism, Socialism and Democracy", Secular Democracy, September(II) 1975, p.27.
17. For example: K. Santhanam, Union-State Relations, in India (1960); A. Krishnaswamy, The Indian Union and the States: A Study in Autonomy and Integration (1964); Asoka Chanda, Federalism in India (1965); and Amal Ray, Inter-Governmental Relations in India (1966)
18. K. Santhanam, Union-State Relations in India, 1960, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, p.50.
19. N. Srinivasan, Survey of Research in Social Sciences : Union-State Relations, 1970, New Delhi, Indian Council

of Social Science Research (Mimeo), pp.19-20. The other areas of Centre-State relations, have attracted greater notice. We have already referred to some studies which deal with the whole gamut of Centre-State relations. The aspect of the Centre-State relations that has received most frequent and competent treatment, however, is the financial aspect, perhaps because the deliberations of the quinquennial Finance Commissions and the formulation of the Five Year Plans provided convenient occasions for its discussion. Some important studies in the area are : D.T.Lakdawala, Union-State Financial Relations in India (1967); G.Thimmiah, An Approach to Centre-State Financial Relations in India (1968); K. Venkataraman, States' Finances in India (1968); S.M.Veeraraghavachari, Union-State Financial Relations in India (1969); and Amiya Chatterji, The Central Financing of State Plans in the Indian Federation (1971).

20. The other two studies listed are: (i) N. Srinivasan, Agricultural Administration in India (1968); and, <sup>S.P.Singh</sup> Centre-State Relations in Agriculture (1969). Among the nine papers listed, four were those presented at the National Convention on Union-State Relations (April 1970) to which we had occasion to make a reference.
21. Educational Studies and Investigations, Vol.I, 1962, New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training, pp.1-32.
22. Ibid, pp.12-13.
23. Ibid, p.13.
24. The Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol.XVI, No.3, July-Sept.1970, pp.378-84.

25. Ibid, p.378.
26. Surendranath Panda, "Centre-State Relations in Education : A Case for Redefinition", Naya Sikshak, January-March, 1970, pp.20-26.
27. G.S. Sharma (Ed.), Educational Planning: Its Legal and Constitutional Implications in India, 1967, Bombay N.M. Tripathi Pvt. Ltd.
28. Ibid, p.v.
29. We have not mentioned here the voluminous compilation (599 pages) by the Ministry of Education, Government of India, entitled Educational Activities of the Government of India (1963, Delhi, Manager of Publications), a descriptive listing of the educational and training programmes undertaken by the Government of India through its various ministries. Its only possible bearing on the present study is that it shows the extensiveness of the educational activities of the Central Government inspite of the fact that education is a State subject.
30. Hollis P. Allen, The Federal Government and Education, 1950, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc. Naik's paper on the role of the Government of India in education seems to have been considerably influenced by Allen's study.
31. Dawson Hales, Federal Control of Public Education: A Critical Appraisal, 1954, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University.
32. For example, two highly readable, though brief, Australian Studies, selected at random are: (i) P.D.Tannock, "Federal Movement into Australian Education", The Journal of Educational Administration, Vol.XII, No.1, May 1974, pp.3-16;

- and (ii) P.D. Tannock and I.K. Birth, "Constitutional Responsibility for Education in Australia: the Federal Government's Latent Power", The Australian Journal of Education, Vol.XVI, No.2, June 1972, pp.116-124.
33. A term used by Sayre in a similar context. See W.S.Sayre, "The Politics of Education", Teachers' College Record, 1963, p.178.
34. It is thus no accident, as Srinivasan rightly points out, that most studies in the field of Centre-State relations belong to the second decade of the constitution coming into operation. See N. Srinivasan, op.cit., p.22.
35. Koerner also makes the point in a similar context. See James D. Koerner, Who Controls American Education? A Guide for Laymen, 1968, Boston, Beacon Press, p.vii.
36. See Administrative Reforms Commission, Machinery of the Government of India and its Procedures of Work: An Interim Report (submitted by a Study Team), 1967, Mimeographed), p.8.
37. See for example, D.L. Mazumdar, loc.cit., and P.C. Mathur, op.cit., p.36. For a detailed reference to centre-state conflicts after 1967, see Hirendra Nath Roy, "Planning for Development and Union-State Conflicts", paper presented to the seminar on Union-State Relations in India (1969) organised by the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, typescript, passim.
38. See, for example, P.C. Mathur, op.cit., p.35.
39. The extreme secretiveness of governmental agencies in these matters is well-known. These agencies betray a tendency (particularly in the case of Indian scholars) to treat every trivial information at their disposal as arcana imperii. No less a person than Prof. Gadgil had occasion to refer to

this and cite the surprising instance of the Planning Commission refusing information to even an official body like the Foodgrains Enquiry Commission See D.R. Gadil, Planning and Economic Policy in India, 1972, Poona, Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, pp.166-67.

40. There are, however, instances of reports of plan discussions being made available to foreign scholars by some state governments. The Tamil Nadu Government, for example, had given Hanson access to one report on plan discussions relating to that State. See A.H. Hanson, The Process of Planning, 1966, London, Oxford University Press, p.366.
41. Jackson Toby, op.cit., p.602 (Glossary, sub voce).
42. Gunnar Myrdal, Objectivity in Social Research, 1969, New York, Pantheon Books, p.9.
43. Ibid, p.5.
44. For a succinct, yet clear exposition of the concept of 'needs' in this tradition, see Alex Inkeles, What is Sociology, 1965, New Delhi, Prentice-Hall of India, pp.64-65.
45. The concepts here and the terminology used may seem to some to foreshadow a structural-functional or systems approach in our analysis. This, however, is not the case. Though advantage will be taken of the insights provided by them, no effort is made in the present study to apply the approaches with any consistency.
46. See, Harold Lasswell, Politics - Who Gets What, When, How? 1936, New York, Whittlesey House, p.19.
47. See, Jackson Toby, Contemporary Society: An Introduction to Sociology (Second Edition), 1971, New York, John Wiley and Sons, p.603 (Glossary, sub voce).



48. Holt and Turner, for example. See Robert J. Holt and John E. Turner, op.cit., pp.3-5.
49. Frederick M.Wirt, "Theory and Research Needs in the Study of American Educational Politics", The Journal of Educational Administration, Vol.VIII, No.1, May, 1970, pp.73-74.
50. See D.L. Mazumdar, "A Note on Approaches to the Study of Centre-State Relations" in S.N. Jain et al (Ed.), op.cit., p.107.
51. See Ibid.