

Decolonizing Social Science Studies: An analysis of Post-NEP 2020 university curriculum in India

¹Pramod Kumar

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science Swami Shraddhanand College, University of Delhi, Delhi – 110036 (<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5499-0209>)

Email ID- Kumar.pramod088@gmail.com

HOW TO CITE: | ABSTRACT:

Pramod Kumar (2026). 'Decolonizing Social Science Studies: An analysis of Post-NEP 2020 university curriculum in India' International Journal of Special Education, 41(23s), 475 - 485

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

The very spirit of education and its structure were adversely affected by the advent of colonial rule in India. The very purpose of colonial education was to create a sense of superiority of Western culture. So, from the very beginnings, modern colonial education in India was premised on the idea of establishing colonial dominance over India. Thus, such education started as a tool of dominance, which was strengthened and institutionalised through the structures of modern education in universities. It was also intended to create a group of low-paid Indian officials who were to work as a conduit for the colonial masters. The basic purpose of this modern education was to establish unquestioned control and hegemony of the British over the Indians. National Education Policy 2020 critically examines the existing theoretical framework for teaching and researching social sciences in Indian universities.

Keywords: Decolonisation, Social Science Studies, Higher Education, National Education Policy, University, Epistemology

Colonial Education Policy and Social Science Curriculum Reform

Education has taken a central stage in the shaping of modern India. The modern discussions on language policy, curriculum reform, access, and equity can never be complete without simultaneously analyzing their colonial roots. The British colonial education policies were not impartial, interventionist policies whose main aim was to disseminate literacy or modern knowledge. Instead, they were fundamentally ingrained in the colonial politics and economy and served as tools in restructuring knowledge, power, and social desire (Kumar, 2005).

The struggle to construct a pro-people transformative 'national' vision of education in

India has been going on since the East India Company time. Macaulay wrote a letter in 1835 to lay the framework of the British colonial education policy. Macaulay's goal was to form 'a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect. He was of the view that through English education they may create legitimising structures for the British way of life (Macaulay Minutes 1835). This ideological bias was codified by the Despatch of Wood of 1854, which is commonly referred to as the Magna Carta of English education in India (East India Company 1854). The Hunter Commission (1882) concentrated on primary training as well as local administration, yet did not address structural underfunding.

The first recorded challenge to this policy framework was given by Savitribai Phule in 1848 in Pune (Deshpandey, 2002), who opened schools for girls and boys belonging to backward classes and castes in their mother tongue. Mahatma Jyotirao Phule stands out as an organic intellectual of the oppressed classes and castes. Rammohun Roy, Ishwarchandra Vidyasagar, Vivekananda, and others brought out the caste biases underlying modern Hinduism.

The Arnoldian curriculum, with its necessary modifications, took care of this imperialist design. The ideology of Macaulay and James Mill was made the basis in this regard. Implicit in it is the Gramscian notion of “domination” one hand, and on the other, emphasising imperial “hegemony” by asserting the intellectual and moral “superiority of English ideals” by creating an image of the “ideal” Englishman. Arguably, the Gramscian notion is not merely a theoretical construct but a strangely accurate description of a historical process. Though the autonomous character of the university was affirmed, it was supposed to produce an intellectual elite that would interpret to their “countrymen” the European learning and moral energy by which their national being may be renovated.

University curriculum, thus, was an alternate mode of social control. The imperial administrators, time and again, reiterated that “university education” was primarily aimed at “training and disciplining mental faculties of the Indians”. The British Indian officials sought to control the university’s affairs in two ways. Firstly, Lord Curzon sought to control the university by officialising its administration. This he did despite universal opposition from the Indian nationalists (Lord Curzon 1904).

The policy of anglicisation meant re-moulding of the “Indian character” to suit imperial needs. The nineteenth-century anglicist curriculum served to confer power as well as to fortify British rule against real or imagined threats from a potentially rebellious subject population. The curriculum represented the perfect synthesis of these two opposing positions, an instrument of “discipline and management”. A cursory look at the

curriculum of Bombay University reveals that the ulterior motive of the missionaries was thus surreptitiously inserted through the instrumentality of the curriculum (Ganachari, 2008).

The first major change in the curriculum of the BA and MA courses of the Bombay University came in 1878-79. Students were now introduced to the works on logic and moral philosophy as well as political economy – of J.S. Mill, Herbert Spencer, and Henry Sidgwick. Thomas Carlyle’s French Revolution now figured in syllabi, which intended to mirror what he thought to be stark reality. Students also studied the writings of “Junius”. Also, English history – political and constitutional (which included an emphasis on constitutional law, manners, literature, political geography) was now introduced at the BA and MA levels (Ganachari, 2008).

When the repressive administrative measures attracted severe criticism in the Indian press, nationalist sentiment steadily began shifting towards extremism. Now, it became a customary habit among the officials to lay the blame on the prevalent educational system, particularly the university curriculum. What can we expect from a system under which our students read more of Milton, Racine, and Goethe than of Ramdas and Tukaram?

Accordingly, Lord Curzon effected this change by appointing an Indian Universities Commission in January 1902. When the report of the commission was published, its reactionary character raised a storm of protest in all parts of the country. It was generally felt that an attempt was being made, not at the reform of the existing institutions, but at their wholesale destruction by doing away with the popular basis of education. It was commonly perceived to be an attempt on the part of the viceroy to “officialise” the universities, and that the universities would be “practically converted into government departments”. But despite strong protests, the bill was eventually passed on March 21, 1904, as the Indian Universities Act, 1904 (Ghosh, 2014).

On December 18, 1908, R.E. Enthovan, Secretary to the Education Department, Bombay government, informed the Vice-Chancellor of the suggestions that Sir George Clarke wanted to be conveyed regarding examinations, abolition of the matriculation and the previous examinations, and most importantly, the history curriculum. The controversy was heightened by the proposal of the chancellor to drop the teaching of English history (political and constitutional) as a compulsory subject for the BA examination. The plain fact was that the government did not want English history to be studied by Indian students because of the belief that “it filled the minds of the students with western ideas of liberty and independence”. The courses of study of the university were too antiquated and inadequate to meet the demands of a scientific and industrial age; he attempted to dabble in the curriculum that made the nationalist senators and syndics of the university, led by Pheroze Shah Mehta, suspicious. The university senate was often converted into a battlefield thereafter. The high and noble aims of liberal education now seemed to give way to a strange type of education where obsequious “loyalty” to the government was the chief objective (Ghosh 2014).

The assertion of the anti-colonial movement in education took a new turn with the civilisational critique of the Western capitalist development model offered by Gandhi in his seminal ‘Hind Swaraj’ (1909), followed by his historic call in the 1920s to quit British educational institutions and establish national educational institutions to advance the struggle for ‘swaraj’ (self-rule). Mahatma Gandhi founded a series of national universities during the first Non-Cooperation movement in 1920-1922. These included the Gujarat Vidyapeeth, Kashi Vidyapeeth, Bihar Vidyapeeth, Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth and Jamia Millia Islamia. Hindi or the vernacular languages were the medium of instruction in these universities. Mahatma Gandhi found the British system of education an “unmitigated evil”. He felt it was impractical and destructive of the Indian imagination. It ignored everything that India had discovered in its educational experience. But even the national universities did

not perform the true functions of instruction of higher education, because they were more concerned with character formation and building the national movement to fight the Raj than with cultivating the intellect (Gandhi 1909)

Tagore believed that the modern university, as collective representation, embodied the essential world-view of western civilisation. Tagore argued that each university was an embodiment of an archetypal set. The Western university as the microcosm of civilisation reflected the mind of the city. In India, however, civilisation was associated with the forest “taking on its distinctive character from its origin and environment”. Its intellect sought spiritual harmony with nature, while the mind of the city sought its subjugation, extending its boundary walls around its acquisitions. The sage in the forest hermitage was not interested in acquiring and dominating, but in realising and enlarging his consciousness by growing with and into his surroundings. Rabindranath Tagore tried a different kind of educational experiment at Shantiniketan, where he founded the Visva-Bharati in 1921. He did not think of it as just another university but one that attempted to synthesise Asian and Western culture. He respected Western knowledge, but his concern was that English education had alienated the intelligentsia both from the common people and from its roots. He believed that India, while it had to cherish its past, could not also cling to its traditional orthodoxies (Vishvanathan, 2000).

KC Bhattacharya, in his speech in 1931 on the decolonisation of ideas. It is indeed a travesty that Bhattacharya’s speech did not attract the attention of Indian intellectuals to the extent it merited. An alternative thought process utilising Indian intellectual traditions and contributions will herald productive debates in the context of decolonisation. He said that the beautiful tree of education was cut down by the Britishers who made India more illiterate than it was a hundred years ago. This intellectual class has labored to justify their understanding of universalising Europe as against the post-colonial view of provincialised Europe: “a relatively small

English-speaking elite whose attitude toward the masses was alternately benevolent and exploitative but never inclusive". These movements and deliberations against Eurocentric policies and philosophy have been identified as a nationalist narrative.

Gandhi's radical pedagogic proposal, *Nai Taleem* critique colonial pedagogy as well as curriculum. The epistemic challenge posed by *Nai Taleem* is to the hegemony of the colonial notion of knowledge production. Gandhi's concept of education is of great significance in the contemporary situation. His philosophical concept of education is entirely based on the development of human personality, to maintain discipline, to create manual work with learning, and to develop the culture of peace (Gandhi 1963).

Kapil Kapoor argues that Indian civilization has always attached great value to knowledge — witness its amazingly large body of intellectual texts, the world's largest collection of manuscripts, its attested tradition of texts, thinkers and schools in so many domains of knowledge. In the *Shrimad Bhagavad Gita*, Lord Krishna tells Arjuna that knowledge is the great purifier and liberator of the self. India's knowledge tradition is ancient and uninterrupted, like the flow of the river Ganga, from the Vedas (Upanishads) to Sri Aurobindo; knowledge, or *janana*, has been at the centre of all rational and speculative inquiry in India (Kapil 2005).

The above thinkers critique colonial knowledge, curriculum, pedagogy, and the university system. They believe that knowledge should be based on Indian values, culture, and history, which is based on egalitarian principles and is inclusive in nature. But historically, education was based on non-egalitarian principles and its nature was exclusionary. For *Shudras* and women in the *Aryan* society, study of the *Vedas* was forbidden, and they learnt their professional knowledge in agriculture and animal husbandry, spinning and weaving, fine arts and crafts through the expertise of their own families. The *Shudras* had no right to education (Altekar 1948).

To institutionalise social education and have a continuous follow-up, Jotirao established '*Satyashodhak Samaj*' on September 24, 1873. Motivation from Kabir's thoughts played an important role in the establishment of the *Satyashodhak Samaj* (Phule). In order to destroy social and religious slavery, the *Satyashodhak Samaj* was established by Jotirao. The *Satyashodhak Samaj* emphasized an egalitarian notion of education. The required educational system for the downtrodden, women, and underprivileged sections of society was mentioned in various programmes of the *Satyashodhak Samaj*, and it is also reflected in Jyotirao's writings.

Ambedkar, who culminated them in the form of the Dalit movement, stressed the importance of education in the emancipation schema of the oppressed people. Ambedkar symbolically discarded the exclusionary regime of Manu by burning Manusmriti in 1927 (Ambedkar 1993). He published *Mook Nayak*, the first of many newspapers for Dalits. His message to the Dalits: "Educate, Organise, and Agitate," reached far and wide. Dr. Ambedkar's views on education have yet to be studied deeply — this even though he had been working in the field of education since he founded the *Hitkarini Sabha* in 1924. Ensuring that more and more of the backward classes got an education was among the priorities of the Sabha, and with that purpose, it established several colleges, hostels, libraries and reading centres. The Sabha established hostels in Sholapur and Belgaum in 1935 and a free reading centre. Ambedkar's social-philosophical views rested on the bedrock of egalitarianism. Human dignity and self-respect were central to his social philosophy. He wanted to use education to establish justice, equality, fraternity, freedom, and fearlessness in society. He wanted to replace the birth-based society with a value-based one. It goes without saying that these moral values can be promoted only through education. Ambedkar was deeply influenced by Buddhist philosophy, and he advocated the development of morality in all people.

The writer of *The Wretched of the Earth*, Frantz Fanon, is not wrong when he says: “I had rationalised the world and the world has rejected me based on colour prejudice. Since no agreement was possible on the level of reason, I threw myself back towards unreason. It was up to the white man to be more irrational than I...I am made of the irrational. Up to the neck in the irrational.” (Fanon) Although ideologies imposed by the West have been the cause of destruction, disunity, and de-harmonisation, it would be an overt generalisation to dismiss everything from the West as destructive. Western apologists then come up with new theories to resolve the crisis they have created. However, a similar past epistemology was employed to comprehend the crisis. History is a witness that the seeds of future disunity, deconstruction and devastation remain embedded in their ideologies and epistemologies.

They do not address the fundamentals of Western civilisation, nor are they ready to accept the finer human traits of ancient India. Again, to quote Frantz Fanon: “Colonised people — people in whom an inferiority complex has taken root,

Paulo Freire (1921-1997) puts it in another way: there is a natural tendency among the oppressed to resemble the oppressors. He uses ‘liberation literacy’ to create mass political awareness along with literacy teachings. Therefore, political decolonisation is not as difficult as the challenge of rejuvenating ourselves to recreate our ideas, which have remained suppressed and uncontextualised.

Suresh C. Ghosh evokes the thirteenth century to help us understand the antagonism created by curriculum “imported” from elsewhere. Ghosh recounts pivotal points of the British colonial past. Among the remains, in curricular terms, is a “textbook culture” wherein too many teachers enjoy little freedom and, specifically, insufficient influence over the curriculum. Despite dehumanising hierarchies associated with colonisation, there have been, all along, courageous individuals who have insisted on a different idea of India (Ghosh 2014).

Claude Alvares raises a serious question: which social sciences are taught and researched in various Indian universities have been uncritically imported from the European academic tradition. It is proposed that not just the content but even the assumptions and methodologies. George, Varghese K, took forward Alvares’ arguments and says that, while eurocentrism is a problem in Indian disciplines of knowledge today, a careful understanding of the methodological and conceptual issues involved in the diversification, interdisciplinarity and the advancement of the western systems of knowledge is required (Alvares, 2011).

Bhikhu Parekh uses a very appropriate term, ‘decolonisation of imagination’. Hans-Georg Gadamer, through his term ‘fusion of horizons’, seeks to extend this human project to something far loftier. However, his work is also a mere attempt to accommodate the efforts at decolonisation. Any knowledge system should be inclusive; only then can decolonisation of the mind take shape and become constructive and productive (Parekh).

Dipankar Gupta argues that our social sciences are not West-oriented nor Eurocentric, but are designed to enquire into social conditions that only democracy can create. By the same token, it is democracy that allows Economics, Political Science and Sociology to coexist happily and with profit. All of them depend on the same context, namely, society; and all of them must accept the grand fact of errors across all relevant social actions. The strength and depth of a democracy can be judged from the strength and depth of its social sciences. Take away democracy and watch Sociology, Economics and Political Science get wasted as if on barren soil. Consequently, it would be incorrect to characterise the social sciences as either Western or Eurocentric. If anything, they should be seen as citizen-centric, perhaps even “citizentric,” disciplines (Gupta 2016).

Krishna Kumar (1991/2005) posits that the British education policy was informed by a political agenda that sought to justify colonial rule through the influence of the curriculum and

access selection. In line with Kumar, the colonial government did not want mass education; rather, it wanted to produce a culturally Anglicized new class of intermediates who would internalize colonially acceptable values yet would not be apportioned as part of the general population.

Gauri Viswanathan (1989), who reveals how the sphere of English literary studies became a strong ideological weapon during the colonial period in India. Instead of passively receiving aesthetic knowledge, English literature made British moral values, the hierarchy of their culture, and civilized notions of civilization the norm.

Manish Jain argues that curriculum studies have two overlapping axes. First, colonial experience, trajectory, practice, and tussles in nation-building and democracy in India, which locate curriculum in relation to the larger context and development. Second, work in the area of education curriculum and textbooks by state and non-state institutions to understand the ideas that have shaped curriculum studies and debates in India (Jain, 2015). The field of curriculum was/is largely shaped by its narrow focus on designing curriculum. In Indian Universities, the demography of students has changed slightly, and the faculty too (symbolically).

Aditya Nigam believes that the task of reconstructing social science studies for our egalitarian purposes requires deep engagement with Indian composite, diverse, intellectual traditions and epistemology (Nigam 2014). According to Gyan Prakash, colonial education is also a central factor that defined science and modernity in India (Prakash 1992). David Arnold points out how the colonial institutions were discriminatory in what kind of scientific disciplines they propagated in the interest of the imperial regime, which included medicine, engineering, and surveying. Scientific education was a close preserve of urban elites and helped to emphasize the disruption of classes and deny the general population an opportunity to be transformed. Even though colonial science led to some technological and professional advancement, it also excluded other

epistemologies and enhanced Western paradigms (Arnold, 2000).

National Education Policy 2020

In independent India, the idea of universities as spaces of critical knowledge and academic freedom. According to Jawaharlal Nehru, "A University stands for humanism, for tolerance, for reason, for the adventure of ideas and for the search of truth. It stands for the onward march of the human race towards ever higher objectives. If the universities discharge their duties adequately, then it is well with the nation and the people" (Nehru, 1947). Five major committee has formed in higher education since independence. First, the Radhakrishnan Report (1948) has numerous references to the freedom of conscience and university autonomy. Second, the Kothari Education Commission Report (1964) observed, "The future of India is shaped in her/his classrooms". Unfortunately, the contents of most Indian school-university textbook, curriculum reflect and reinforce negative values, which are contested in contemporary India, resulting in the exclusion, or at best only the ambiguous inclusion, of a substantial proportion of school children. Third, the National Education Policy (1986) emphasises that education must play a positive and interventionist role in correcting social and regional imbalance, empowering women, and in securing a rightful place for the disadvantaged and the minorities. The government is firmly committed to providing education for all, the priority areas being free and compulsory elementary education, covering children with special needs, eradication of illiteracy, education for women's equality, and special focus on the education of SCs/STs and Minorities.

Fourth, the Yashpal Committee Report (2009) recommended that syllabi and textbooks should address a diverse milieu, varying needs and facilities, and ensure that all children 'know' the same 'facts'. Independent India embarked on its journey by pledging to create a democratic structure of education where nobody would be without their mandatory entitlements. Fifth, the National Education Policy (2020) focused on a

holistic, multidisciplinary, and skill-oriented education system. The policy is based on the pillars of “Access, Equity, Quality, Affordability, Accountability”.

The purpose of the new education policy 2020 is to develop good human beings. This national education policy envisions an education system rooted in Indian ethos that contributes directly to transforming India that is Bharat. The Policy envisages that the curriculum and pedagogy of our institutions must develop among the students a deep sense of respect towards the Fundamental Duties and Constitutional values. The vision of the Policy is to instill among the learners a deep-rooted pride in being Indian, not only in thought, but also in spirit, intellect, and deeds, as well as to develop knowledge, skills, values, and dispositions that support responsible commitment to human rights, sustainable development and living, and global well-being, thereby reflecting a truly global citizen.

This National Education Policy 2020 is the first education policy of the 21st century and aims to address the many growing developmental imperatives of our country. This Policy proposes the revision and revamping of all aspects of the education structure, including its regulation and governance, to create a new system that is aligned with the aspirational goals of 21st-century education, including SDG4, while building upon India's traditions and value systems. The National Education Policy lays particular emphasis on the development of the creative potential of each individual. It is based on the principle that education must develop not only cognitive capacities - both the ‘foundational capacities’ of literacy and numeracy and ‘higher-order’ cognitive capacities, such as critical thinking and problem-solving- but also social, ethical, and emotional capacities and dispositions.

National Education Policy 2020 and Indigenous Knowledge in University

This colonial genealogy is vital to a critical approach in the present with the debates of educational reform and decolonization in India. Britishers had destroyed indigenous knowledge

traditions. The degradation of indigenous education was therefore not an inescapable aspect of modernization but a by-product of policies made by favouring the colonial epistemologies over systems of local knowledge. Later historians have highlighted that this displacement also has led to cultural alienation and epistemic inequality that still haunt Indian education.

The pursuit of knowledge (Jnan), wisdom (Pragyaa), and truth (Satya) was always considered in Indian thought and philosophy as the highest human goal. The aim of education in ancient India was not just the acquisition of knowledge as preparation for life in this world, or life beyond schooling, but for the complete realization and liberation of the self. World-class institutions of ancient India such as Takshashila, Nalanda, Vikramshila, and Vallabhi set the highest standards of multidisciplinary teaching and research and hosted scholars and students from across backgrounds and countries. The Indian education system produced great scholars such as Charaka, Susruta, Aryabhata, Varahamihira, Bhaskaracharya, Brahmagupta, Chanakya, Chakrapani Datta, Madhava, Panini, Patanjali, Nagarjuna, Gautama, Pingala, Sankardev, Maitreyi, Gargi and Thiruvalluvar, among numerous others, who made seminal contributions to world knowledge in diverse fields such as mathematics, astronomy, metallurgy, medical science and surgery, civil engineering, architecture, shipbuilding and navigation, yoga, fine arts, chess, and more. Indian culture and philosophy have had a strong influence on the world. These rich legacies of world heritage must not only be nurtured and preserved for posterity but also researched, enhanced, and put to new uses through our education system.

Higher education plays an extremely important role in promoting human as well as societal wellbeing and in developing India as envisioned in its Constitution - a democratic, just, socially conscious, cultured, and humane nation upholding liberty, equality, fraternity, and justice for all.

Higher education significantly contributes towards sustainable livelihoods and economic development of the nation. As India moves towards becoming a knowledge economy and society, more and more young Indians are likely to aspire to higher education. Given the 21st century requirements, quality higher education must aim to develop good, thoughtful, well-rounded, and creative individuals. It must enable an individual to study one or more specialized areas of interest at a deep level, and also develop character, ethical and Constitutional values, intellectual curiosity, scientific temper, creativity, spirit of service, and 21st-century capabilities across a range of disciplines including sciences, social sciences, arts, humanities, languages, as well as professional, technical, and vocational subjects. A quality higher education must enable personal accomplishment and enlightenment, constructive public engagement, and productive contribution to society. It must prepare students for more meaningful and satisfying lives and work roles and enable economic independence. For the purpose of developing holistic individuals, it is essential that an identified set of skills and values will be incorporated at each stage of learning, from pre-school to higher education. At the societal level, higher education must enable the development of an enlightened, socially conscious, knowledgeable, and skilled nation that can find and implement robust solutions to its own problems. Higher education must form the basis for knowledge creation and innovation, thereby contributing to a growing national economy. The purpose of quality higher education is, therefore, more than the creation of greater opportunities for individual employment. It represents the key to more vibrant, socially engaged, cooperative communities and a happier, cohesive, cultured, productive, innovative, progressive, and prosperous nation.

Jyotiba Phule, Ambedkar, Periyar, Rabindranath Tagore, Mahatma Gandhi, Jiddu Krishnamurti, Raja Rammohan Roy, Dayanand Saraswati, Vivekanand, and RSS-affiliated (Bharati Vidya Mandir) schools are among those who established schools/ universities with curricula that addressed the gaps between intellectual ideas

and everyday life, between children and adults, between the past and the present, itself compressed also by the weight of the future. His approach was different from others. Text, context, and interpretation was/is different.

Delhi University and NEP- 2020

The Preamble of the Delhi University Undergraduate Curriculum Framework-2022 underlines the historical perspective, philosophical basis, and contemporary realities of higher education as enshrined in the National Education Policy 2020 and endeavours to synchronize these cornerstones while charting the road ahead for the state of higher education. The University of Delhi, a premier seat of teaching, learning, and research in higher education, acclaimed nationally and internationally, has nurtured the quest for reaching the peak in every sphere of education, in its true sense, in the process of its contribution to nation-building. Being a Central University, mandated to act as the torchbearer in expanding the horizons of human resource development through expansion of higher education, it has always paid adequate premium towards constructive and meaningful innovation as a regular feature in its undergraduate curriculum development over the years (DU-UGCF 2022).

The Undergraduate Curriculum Framework-2022 (UGCF) is meant to bring about systemic change in the higher education system in the University and align itself with the National Education Policy 2020. The following objectives of NEP are kept in perspective while framing UGCF:

~ to promote each student's holistic development in both academic and non-academic spheres;

~ to provide flexibility to students so that learners can choose their learning

trajectories and programmes, and thereby choose their paths in life according to their talents and interests;

~ to eliminate harmful hierarchies among disciplines/fields of study and silos between different areas of learning;

~ Multidisciplinary and holistic education to ensure the unity and integrity of all knowledge;

to promote creativity and critical thinking and to encourage logical decision-making and innovation;

~ to promote ethics and human & Constitutional values;

~ to promote multilingualism and the power of language in learning and teaching;

~ to impart life skills such as communication, cooperation, teamwork, and resilience;

~ to promote outstanding research as a requisite for outstanding education and development;

~ to incorporate Indian Knowledge System relevant for a particular discipline or field of studies.

The real test of any education policy is not how well it reads in an official document, but how deeply it enters the working life of an institution. Delhi University has become one of the most visible sites where NEP 2020 has been translated into the actual academic system.

Conclusion

In public universities, reform does not become real only through speeches. It becomes real

References:

- Altekar, A.S. (1948), Education in Ancient India, Benares Nand Kishore & Bros. Educational Publishers.3rd edition, Varanasi
- Apple, Michael W. (1990), Ideology and Curriculum, 2nd edition, New York: Routledge
- All India Survey on Higher Education (2021-2022), Ministry of Education, GOI.
- Ambedkar, B. R, (2005), Annihilation of Caste, Critical Quest Publication, New Delhi
- Bhattacharyya, K. C. (1928) "Swaraj in Ideas," in Indian Philosophy in English: From Renaissance to Independence, (ed). Nalini Bhushan and Jay L. Garfield Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011
- Bhattacharya, Sabyasachi (ed.) (2013), Education and the Disprivileged: Nineteenth and Twentieth Century India, Orient Longman, New Delhi.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2001) "Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference", New Delhi, Oxford University Press
- Claude, Alvares (2011), 'A Critique of Eurocentric Social Science and the Question of Alternatives', Vol. 46, No. 22, Economic and Political Weekly

through Academic Council meetings, Executive Council approvals, curriculum appendices, ordinances, eligibility rules, and departmental implementation. These documents may appear dry, but they are the skeleton of institutional change. The Policy (NEP-2020), designed to deal with the new social, economic, and technical order of the 21st century, has been universally appreciated. Gandhi's *Nai Talim* and *Swadeshi* movements were supposed to constitute a fundamentally new framework of education. However, these ideals remained mere goals and ideals, whereas the old colonial structures remained intact without essentially changing in character. The same pattern of instruction and curriculum-making prevailed –that created two Indians—one Bharat and the other India. Post-colonialism, in the interstices of new education policy, is a crucial area of study for those interested in issues of colonialism, racism, caste, gender, and the ways in which education has been complicit with colonial aspirations. In pursuit of Aatma Nirbhar Bharat, NEP-2020 lays huge emphasis on skill development and employability.

Acknowledgement

I sincerely thank Sr. Prof. Rekha Saxena, Head of Department, Department of Political Science, University of Delhi and Prof. Parveen Garg, Principal, Swami Shraddhanand College, University of Delhi for their constant support and guidance towards this research work.

- Deshpandey G.P. (2002), *Selected Writings of Jyotirao Phule* (Edited with annotations and Introduction), Leftword, New Delhi.
- Dewey, John (1916), *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*, Macmillan, USA
- Fanon, Frantz (2004), *The Wretched of the Earth*, Grove Press, New York,
- Freire, Paulo (1970), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. A continuum. New York. London
- Ghosh, C. Suresh (2007) *History of Education in India*, Rawat Publications, New Delhi.
- Ganachari, Arvind (2008) *Imperialist Appropriation and Disciplining the Indian Mind (1857-1917): Whose History?*, Economic and Political Weekly
- Guru, Gopal (2017) 'How Egalitarian Are the Social Sciences in India?' *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 52, Issue No. 34, August 26.
- Guru, Gopal and Sarukkai, Sundar (2012), *The Cracked Mirror: An Indian Debate on Experience and Theory*, Oxford Publications, New Delhi.
- Ilaiah, Kancha (2010), *The Weapon of the Other: Dalitbahujan Writings and the Remaking of Indian Nationalist Thought*, Pearson Education
- Jadhav, Narendra (2008), 'Empowerment of Dalits and Adivasis: Role of Education in the Emerging Economy', Working Paper Series, Number09-04, Centre for the Advanced Study of India, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Jain, Manish (2015) *Curriculum Studies in India; Colonial Roots and Post-Colonial Trajectories*, In Pinar F William (ed.) *Curriculum Studies in India: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstance*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York,
- Kapoor, Kapil and Avadesh K. Singh (2005), *Indian Knowledge System*, IAS Shimla
- Kumar, Krishna (2005), *Political Agenda of Education: A Study of Colonialist and Nationalistic Ideas*, 2nd edition, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- Kumar, Vivek (2016) 'How Egalitarian is Indian Sociology?', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.51, Issue No.25, June 18.
- Mani, Braj Ranjan. (2014) *Knowledge and Power: A Discourse for Transformation*, New Delhi: Manohar
- Macaulay, T. B. (1835). Minute on Indian education (2 February 1835). <https://home.iitk.ac.in/~hcverma/Article/Macaulay-Minutes.pdf>
- Memmi, Albert (1991) "The Colonizer and the Colonized", Boston, Beacon Press
- Nandy, Ashis (1983) "The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism", New Delhi, Oxford University
- National Knowledge Commission, Report to the nation, 2006-2009, GOI, 2009
- National Education Policy 2020, Ministry of Education, Government of India, New Delhi
- Paranjape Markand (1993) *Decolonization and Development: Hind Swaraj*, Sage, New Delhi
- Parekh, Bhikhu (1995) "Decolonisation of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge and Power", London, New Jersey, Zed Books
- Patel, M.S. (1953), *The Educational Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*, Navajiva Publishing House, Ahmedabad
- Patel, M.S. (1953), *The Educational Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*, Navajiva Publishing House, Ahmedabad
- Phule, Jyotirao (2019), *Gulamgiri (Slavery)*, Samyak Prakashan, New Delhi.
- Prakash, G. (2002). Civil society, community, and the nation in colonial India. *Etnográfica*, 6(1), 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.4000/etnografica.2845>
- Prakash, G. (1992). Science "gone native" in colonial India. *Representations*. <https://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article/doi/10.2307/2928743/67263/science-Gone-Native-in-Colonial-India>

-
- Rege, Sharmila (2010), 'Education as TrutiyaRatna: Towards Phule-Ambedkarite Feminist Pedagogical Practice', Economic and Political Weekly, October 30
- Said, Edward. W (1978) *Orientalism*, New York, Vintage Books
- Sukumar, N. (2023), *Caste Discrimination and Exclusion in Indian Universities*
A Critical Reflection, Routledge India
- Singh, Shri Prakash (2018), *Politics for a New India*, Rupa Publication, New Delhi.
- Singh, Namwar (1982), *Dusri Prampara Kii Khoj*, Rajkamal Publication, New Delhi (Hindi)
- Sinha, Rakesh (2016), *Swaraj in Ideas; Quest for Decolonisation of the Indian Mind*, Indian Policy Foundation, New Delhi
- Thakur, N. Manindra (2022), *Gyan Kii Rajniti: Samaj Adhyayan aur Bhartiya Chintan*, Setu Publication, New Delhi (Hindi)
- Thiong'o, Ngugi wa (1986) "Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature", London, Heinemann Educational.
- Tilak Jandhyala B.G (2014) *Higher Education in India: In Search of Equality, Quality and Quantity*, ed., Orient Blackswan, New Delhi
- University of Delhi, Undergraduate Curriculum Framework 2022 Based on National Education Policy 2020.
www.du.ac.in
- Zastoupil, Lynn and Moir, Martin (1999) (ed), *The Great Indian Education Debate: Documents Relating to the Orientalist-Anglicist Controversy, 1781-1843*
- <https://academicaffairs.du.ac.in/>
- <https://theprint.in/yourturn/subscriberwrites-nep-2020-at-delhi-university-how-a-policy-became-an-academic-architecture/2959346/>