

# KEVIN HARRIS'S THOUGHTS ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION: A CRITICAL EVALUATION

LARRY EBIKEKEME WADA<sup>1</sup>, AZIBAGIRI SAMUEL OMEKWE<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of General Studies, School of Foundation Studies, Bayelsa State College of Health Technology

<sup>2</sup>Department of General Studies, School of Foundation Studies, Bayelsa State College of Health Technology

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8037050>

Published Date: 14-June-2023

---

**Abstract:** This paper critically evaluates Kevin Harris's views, as presented in his work *Education and Knowledge: A Structured Misrepresentation of Reality*. It explores Harris's belief that formal education in capitalist liberal democracies primarily serves to misrepresent reality rather than unravel it. The paper argues that while Harris's views are compelling, they are not entirely original and rely heavily on preexisting ideas. The paper concludes with a critical evaluation of Harris's thoughts on education.

**Keywords:** Education, Philosophy of Education, Structured Misrepresentation, Thoughts System.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The call for the upholding of education can be likened to a call for the illuminating of the human mind from ignorance and illiteracy. This human innate desire to know tends to lead to some questions in the inquiry of the study of education such as; 'What purpose should education serve in the social life of the people?' 'What should be considered the best method, theory or pedagogical framework? How have the existing frameworks so far seen to the progress of the society via its vehicle 'education'? 'Could there be relatively any consensus that humanity given the pre-existing theories from the ancient to contemporary times shown progress or any good to the accomplishment of man as a rational and free being? etc. As a prompt call for action, great minds both on African soil and beyond tendered their voices to these questions, for instance, Bob Marley's calls for the emancipation of the self from mental slavery, as not but ourselves can free our mind. The process whereby man can free his mind is education. (Adams, 2018) Likewise, Steve Bantu Biko expresses his conviction that "the most potent weapon of the oppressor is the mind of the oppressed" which can also be accomplished through the tool of education. (Biko, 1987. 68) Thus, education from their postulations stipulates that it is the tool for the enlightenment of the human mind from bias, prejudices, and manipulations to see reality clearly by ourselves and also to protect our minds from being used as an instrument of oppression against us. It is also a known fact that from time immemorial different great innovations, achievements, and acceptable thought systems (Beliefs and theories) were extensions or the by-products of ideological penetrations and reforms through the vehicle called education. These reforms or given ideas that are shared by some group of people, or representing a connection of world-view culminate into such views as; communism, socialism, capitalism, scientific theories, etc. thereby, becomes a process whereby the conscious mind transmits its belief systems through the vehicle of knowledge that transient from one generation to another. In earnest, the term ideology has been defined as a systematic, elaborates, and delimits system of thoughts, like political ideologies, religious doctrines, etc. Also, ideology has been determined as the subjective dimension of social life, as consciousness in general or as a particular human aspect of society. (Schmid, 1981 p.57)

The question on the methods in the history of education that has impacted mostly the educational development of man and the society to free his mind from the stink of ignorance, external doctrines of theoretical influences, as well as for a man to fit in the society he finds ourselves, has become a subject of great concern over the ages. Now, to achieve this feat, many great philosophers and historians of education provided in their historical writing different pedagogical frameworks, and principles on what structure/methods of education are most suitable for adoption.

Summing up, this work shows Kevin Harris' thoughts on education as appended in his *'Education and Knowledge'* is assessed. Thereafter follows are critical evaluation and conclusion.

### **The Etymology of Education:**

The concept of education and its etymological derivation has over the ages triggered a discussion from plenty of scholars as a suggestive and interesting venture. However, the meaning and origin of the word education have been traced to the Latin word "Educare" which implies "to draw forth". (Patrick 2008. 1) The history of education as seen in some Western chroniclers, precedes the Socratic era, e.g., with the already established institute such as the "Pythagorean school of mystical-science and mathematics in the Greek-speaking city of Crotons" (Moore & Bruder, 2002. 21) serves as a pointer. Nevertheless, Plato the mouthpiece of his master Socrates is seen to launch into the scene with his many ideas on education which spread in his dialogues such as; the 'Republic', 'Crito', 'Lashes' etc., where he trains his pupils in his famous 'Academy'. Aristotle with his two main texts *The Nicomachean Ethics*, and *The Politics (A Treaty in Government)* also emphasized education as for him, education is central, hence, the man that is fulfilled is considered educated. (Barnes, 1982) and other prominent contributors from the medieval era to contemporary times such as; Quintilian who seeks the perfect orator during the child's upbringing, down to Paulo Freire and his famous view of problem posing as a criterium for educating society.

### **Kevin Harris's Thoughts on Education:**

Kevin Harris was born in Sydney to working class Polish emigrants in 1938. He graduated from high school in 1954 and got trained as primary school teacher at Balmain Teachers College from 1956-6. In 1960 he was transferred by the Department of education to a secondary school to teach Geography (1960-1) and Math's/science in inner city Sydney (1962-8). He began university studies as a part-time evening student at Sydney University in 1964, graduating with B.A Hons, 1st in English and education. Harris was appointed Lecturer at Sydney Teachers' College and Tutor at Sydney University during the year 1963-73... He was awarded PhD UNSW in 1979 and published "Education and Knowledge" (1979), "Teachers and Classes" (1982), and "Sex, ideology and religion" (1984) ... he was promoted to Associate Professor in 1987 and appointed Professor of Education Policy Studies at Macquarie University in 1990. Harris also published "Teachers: Constructing the Future" (1994). He was honored with PESA Fellow 1995, and he retired in the year 2000 and was awarded Emeritus status by the University council. (Peters, 2019. 8 & 9)

Kevin Harris is seen in his *Education and Knowledge: The Structured Misrepresentation of Reality* to adopt a Marxist analysis of education in capitalist liberal democracies. He contends that in a class society, education becomes essentially a political act, a form of political manipulation. As a political act, Harris explains that education serves the ruling class's interest by misrepresenting reality and also by legitimating both itself and the misrepresentations it promotes and produces. "These misrepresentations are thus ideological, and serve capitalist interests principally through their role in structuring a consciousness in people that promotes the stability of capitalists' social relations." (Evers, 1980. 220)

Harris still on, in his introductory text asserts that education is centrally and necessarily concerned with the transmission of knowledge. Setting his pedagogical conviction, he asserts:

'Education' has proved to be a slippery concept to handle, and so it is important that, right at the beginning, I make particular use of it clearly. By 'education' I shall be referring to a particular process, or group of processes, by socially approved institutions, of sets of learning experiences that are narrowly confined either to restricted vocational ends or to the development of social skills. Education, then, can be taken to include the provision of learning experience of the transmission of knowledge as it occurs in places like schools, universities, liberal arts colleges, technical colleges, college of advanced education and the like; and to exclude the transmission (and gaining) of knowledge through travel, by accidental experience, at driving school or ballet classes, or in institutions that do not have social approval for the purpose of providing learning experience. (p.1)

Still, Harris believes education as a key feature is that which is formal and institutionalized. Education he claims is a product of or sanctioned by the state, and as such, it is deliberately concerned to provide its charges with a broad understanding of the world. Harris also notes that our knowledge of the world should not be strictly attributed solely through experiences with the overt set curriculum of institutions, as there are other processes through which the transmission of knowledge can be attained, such as the acquisition of highly specialized vocational, or even non-vocational skills.

Harris then goes on to identify the three particular functions through which education supposedly helps people to gain knowledge of the world which are;

- 1) Education selects from the infinite body of knowledge, packages that are thought to be particularly worth knowing.
- 2) Education then provides the means and resources whereby those things can be approached and known. And finally,
- 3) Education applies pedagogical expertise in an attempt to ensure that these things are learned and known.

Harris sadly opines that "the problem, however, is that neither knowledge nor education works in those particular ways". (2) Therefore, an education he contends is a distinctly non-neutral political mechanism or institutionalized process that largely provides and makes legitimate the ways and perspectives by which we come to know the world. Also, he explains education to be a process that enshrines in certain political circumstances, transmitted as knowledge structured distorted misrepresentation of the world.

Harris after a succinct narrative to set his purpose, in chapter three, began his discussion on his ideological inclination whose chief aim is to show how in greater detail the way ideology functions, and also to outline certain conditions where ideology necessarily projects and presents distortion, misrepresentation, and disguises by the real nature of the state of affairs. Echoing the Marxist classical statements, Harris notes two important ideas; the first is ideology is represented as the lived consciousness of the actual political/social events that are taking place (or being aimed for). Hence, ideology is the perception of the world. Also, ideology is a picture of the world seen from a particular point of view, influenced by a multifarious collection of factors. The second point Harris avers is that Marx built a pejorative or belittling sense of ideology by contrasting it with science. Howbeit, Harris explains that his concern is to show that 'ideology is necessarily misrepresentation, and thus a target for judgment of critical preference within a particular set of social relations- a set that is characterized by conflicting interests.

In the view of Aspin (1980), Harris's chapters three and four are devoted to showing that:

Certain social relations and practices necessarily give rise to a particular distorted view of the world, wherein individual are constituted as bearers of that view, such that they fail to recognize not only the distortions and illusions inherent in it, but also the way it actually functions against their best interest. (172)

Still from Aspin's lenses of Harris's conviction, the ideology that determines our perception of the world is necessarily misrepresentative. Hence, Harris's belief emerges not from a consideration of ethical, metaphysical, or logical matters of debate, but rather from a consideration of the concept of interest and its importance role, and power in social relations.

Harris explaining further asserts that ideology or 'lived consciousness' is put forth such that it serves or favours one particular group interest, while it works against the overall best interest of the majority; nonetheless, because of illusions, disguise, and distortions, that fact is not seen or noticed at all. Ideologies Harris contends, spawned from conflict of interest, and they disseminate and propagate their particular views to see that their views or ideas are generally accepted, or at the very least imposed on their targets. For example, Harris identifies that the capitalist does not tend to see themselves as exploiting the workers, and as such does not propagate any ideas to that end. Instead, the capitalist sees themselves as creating jobs, assisting the national economy and interest, and improving the conditions of the factories. The workers who are exploited on the other hand do not seem to see it so. Instead, they are grateful for having jobs, bonuses, incentives, and installed hot showers in the factories.

Bringing down the capitalist exploitative tendencies to the education front, Harris avers:

And surely no teacher, while he might be doing little else than training his pupil to tolerate boredom, really sees himself as doing this, let alone doing this under the manipulation of capitalists who needs workers who will tolerate boredom. Capitalist's teachers and children in all probability sincerely believe that schools are there to educate and disseminate

**International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences**Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp: (17-24), Month: May - June 2023, Available at: [www.noveltyjournals.com](http://www.noveltyjournals.com)

knowledge and critical thoughts conspired to create schools to produce workers well attuned to boredom, and that they fooled teachers, parents and children into believing that schools do something else, is just totally naive. (67&68)

Harris still claims that Ideology when seen from the ‘contest of theory’ (69) shows or illustrates the preplanned arrangement of a child that is born into the world, that has no choice but to adopt into a material world of already formed ideas that serves as the process of human interaction. The human child is deprived of choices for him/her to determine his possible potential given the fact that their parameters are largely determined by social and historical factors. Harris, therefore, asserts that a society that would exclude other forms of child development as he has noticed and explained should be identified or called a “received view” or “prevailing pragmatic way of seeing the world, etc.” He buttresses his claim more explaining that the received view as engendered in the capitalist society is at times seen in the slogan or platitudes such as ‘the American way of life’, ‘a characteristically German outlook and the uncharacteristic principles of Catholicism’. He also identifies things like the Constitution, Bill of Right, Manifestos, etc. as some major sources of these aberrations. In his own words, he said:

The legal system will indicate what is acceptable and unacceptable, both in behaviour and in punishment. The education system will give insight into what it is considered important for people to learn, and how they learn it, the economic system can reveal the development of social relations and the distribution of rewards with respect to the work people do, and their relationships to the mode of production. We would then look at whether the people worship, and if so, how; how much time they have for leisure, and how and how they use it, and so on. (p. 70)

Thus, what should be considered the right way of good behaviour, values, and the theoretical sets of beliefs (received views) that society must conform to? This unassuming societal process in education, Harris criticized stating that what children are made to learn subjects such as Math, English, and so on, is influenced by certain ruling interests. These interests he said children must accept as being true, correct, and worth knowing what those same interest count as correct and worth knowing. Therefore, he closed the section stating that the central thrust of the matter is the received view in a class society is that view that tends to serve the interest of a ruling class. He continues thus: “If we ever pin down such a view in substantive form there can be much value in trying to ascertain who formulated it, how it came to be formulated (a crucial issue, for such views neither ‘materialize’ out of thin air, nor are necessarily formulated in committee rooms) and who it particularly serves and benefits. ...” (p.74)

Harris also identifies repression as an impediment to ultimate growth. He explains that a sure way to sustain a situation where only a monopolistic view prevails in society is to engage the weapon of repression through the use of force to sieve out persons with contrary beliefs by jailing, exiling, and killing oppositions. However, he identifies two problems associated with the approach of repression. He writes thus:

In the first place it can really be successful only if the opposition to the received view is quite minor, or easy to breakdown by making example of a few people. For instance, if in a capitalist society the small ruling class were to dispose of a gigantic laboring class which had somehow become aware of its exploited position, then obviously the ruling class would suffer badly for its own actions. In this instance only the ‘reserve army’ of labourers, or a number equivalent to them could be safely disposed of. The technique of repression can be effective against individuals or minor revolt, but from there on it tends to self-defeating. The second problem with the overt repression approach is that it may bring into practice things that are contrary to the espoused principles of the received view; and this would be a dangerous thing for any ruling class to indulge in, for it immediately exposes contradictions not just between theory and practice, but within both theory and practice... (p.75)

Harris explains for instance if the principle of the received view is freedom of speech, then it would be contradicting and out of place to the dictate of repressive force that is brought against its subjects. In cap, Kelvin Harris opines that repression is negative, untidy, and dangerous in all facet both to the oppressed and the oppressor too. This belief can stimulate or promote the growth of the consciousness it wishes to repress. Consciousness Harris’s state cannot be repressed. Although, the tools of aggression such as machine guns can prevent a person from acting in a certain manner, nonetheless, it will not stop persons from thinking and believing for themselves the truth of things.

Adding more mortar to the blocks of his argument against the interest-serving nature of Class Ideologies especially in the Western capitalist liberal democracies, Harris still affirms that education is in a form of camouflage, an institutionalized

**International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences**Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp: (17-24), Month: May - June 2023, Available at: [www.noveltyjournals.com](http://www.noveltyjournals.com)

system that promotes ignorance by which the ruling class seeks to manipulate and exploit other classes to their peculiar advantage. Harris asserts is conviction more:

Education is a perception-altering drug... In a capitalist liberal democracy is a deliberate system of process that aim to get people to perceive the world in a certain way that favour the ruling class, while at the same time having them believe that they are seeing the world 'objectively'... [It] promote a distorted and illusory view of reality in the name of enquiring into truth. (Quoted in Aspin, 1980. 173)

However, Harris believes that there is no escape from ideology, as we either live in one ideology or another. He therefore posits, if there is any point in escaping or trying to escape from the prevailing ideology in which we live. The answer Harris says is dependent on the nature of that particular ideology. (94). Thus, Harris says if the supposed ideology is determined by social relations and social conditions that work against our best interests, and serve to distort and misrepresent the world to us, we should in our particular interest desist or breakout away from such ideological position. Nevertheless, we cannot simply decide to change our ideological positions as they are mainly determined by ongoing social practices. Harris presses on further:

But what we can do as a necessary prelude is seek out the means and places whereby ideology can be revealed for what they are. If we can at least recognize the existence and operation of these things, then the possibility arises that we might begin to the attempt to free ourselves from the ties they have on our consciousness. (95)

To this end, Harris proposes that Ideologies should be attacked, recognized, and its mystery demystified, so as for a person to come to the awareness of some false consciousness whereby a person sees his or herself, and the world in a distorted way, etc.

Harris still arguing, asserts that it is never the intention of the capitalist to bring about equality, equity, or parity with other classes, but rather capitalism requires a class of capitalists and the working class. It never will invent a class of rulers, exploiters, and oppressors, but instead it ideologically invents a class of oppressed exploited workers. Harris continues with a forecast of the fate of capitalism as it:

Necessarily produces the one class that can make a socialist revolution; and if and when the unity of opposites cracks and the revolution comes, capitalism will be negated by what it itself produced. And not only capitalism go, but with it go the oppression and exploration that preceded it. (125)

Harris argues that education, given the circumstances of a liberal democratic capitalist society is concerned to transmit knowledge that distorts people's view of the world. He continues that education creates easily satisfied 'pigs' and also promotes a pernicious type of ignorance rather than to eradicating ignorance. Harris sharing the views of Helvetius remarks that: Children are born ignorant, but not stupid: it is education that makes them stupid as young educated children are ignorant of the world, just as some adults are usually similarly ignorant. (129)

Harris, as penned down by Aspin, frowns at the empiricist-positivist notion of knowledge as being completely neutral and objective. Instead, he opted for verifications as the sole criterion of meaningfulness, and warranted assertiveness, hence mathematics and science alike were the only subjects that were theory-free, and in which total teacher neutrality was possible. Aspin continues that Harris drawing from the works of such anti-inductivity as Popper, Kuhn, and Feyerabend come to show "how underserved the reputation and respect, is wholly to the good as is his emphasis upon elaboration of the theory-laden-ness of all knowledge of getting". (Aspin, 1980. 175)

Harris still cautions that short shrift be given to the popular view that there is another orthodoxy that is widely regarded as operative in and coercive upon what is referred to as the normal philosophy of education. Herein, particularly Harris believes Peter and Heist "are not the be-all and end-all in the subject and existence of some three or four competing 'paradigms' in just the United Kingdom alone bears testimony to that". (Aspin, 175) Still, in Harris's profession, he rejects some philosophers' accounts of education as being solely concerned with the pursuit of universal truths with the initiation of barbarians into the citadel of knowledge. Further strengthening his stance, Harris quotes Mary Warnock who states that "education is inevitably and necessarily an institutionalized function of people's deepest political and moral preconceptions and is shot through by and intertwined with social forces and social interests". (Quoted in Aspin, 1980, 175)

Finally, Harris having adopted Lakatos's research programme in his pursuit for a clearer answer to the issues of idealization, sadly to his dismay discovered that there were difficulties associated with the programme when applied to the idealization of existing situations and systems which fails to account fully for anomalies. As Aspin reports, Harris is of the opinion that Lakatos's method fails to account for the origin and status of the central core theories, and these weaknesses come out when we attempt to test the implication of Lakatos' methodology in the realm of ideology. To solve this identified gap, Harris proposes the adoption of a radically different account of knowledge and knowledge-getting— "the Marxist notion of knowledge of production", whereby the key notion is that of the 'problematic' (concepts, theories, theoretical tools, the socio-historical context and the relations between all parties to the production of new knowledge). (Aspin, 172)

### **Critical Evaluations of Harris's Educational Thoughts**

Every intellectual endeavours, especially in prints is necessarily subject to the scrutiny of its readers, and Harris's thoughts as contained in his *Education and Knowledge: The structured misrepresentation of reality* is not by any means exempted. A year after the publication of his work, two different authors in the year 1980 gave their verdict in their review of Harris's work.

First, Evers in his closing session remarks that he found Harris's work and ideas invaluable for use as a course textbook. (Evers, 1980 p. 220) Second, Aspin informs that there are likely weaknesses in Harris's ideas. In his very words:

Let us regard Harris view as a set of hypotheses which, if they are to be 'scientific' (in a Popperian's sense), we must try to falsify. At this juncture we have therefore to ask whether there are any points of weakness in his views, at which criticism can be directed, and the answer bro this question has unfortunately, to be that there are. ((Aspin, 1980. 176)

Firstly, Harris's work is identified with inconsistencies as seen in the earlier chapters of his work; he adopts a Popperian critique to refute inductivist and the empiricist approach to knowledge. Later on, he openly declared his preference for Lakatos's refined version of Popper's methodological falsifications which for him, constitute a sound basis, even though it is with some further modification for a progressive research programme that enables him to make critical decisions of and between theories. (Aspin, 1980. 177)

In addition to Aspin's observation, one could easily come to the conclusion that Harris seems to be romancing the scientific theories with his mind games of words in other to arrive at his reasonable justification for the idealization of existing systems of thought. Harris is seen to claim no allegiance or solidarity to any of the prescribed established scientific methods. This point is well observed as in the end, Harris dumped his highly revered Lakatos's methodology due to his suppose identified weaknesses as the method fails to account for the origin and status of the central core theories.

Secondly, Harris's central ideas could be seen to be drawn from diverse scholars before him. For instance, he adopts the Marxist socialist system over the capitalist system. Also, there are traces of Locke's and Dewey's Liberalism in the school structure and as regards the relationship between the teacher and student. Harris in addition, borrowed ideas from the Freire's pedagogic convictions especially, Freire's idea of "consciousness raising". However, Harris's major contention in his work appears to seem as if he has brought a new card to the table to warrant a somewhat novel discovery. However, in an actual sense, he managed to re-echo the thoughts of the already mentioned scholars with his caption "The structured misrepresentation of reality" which at the crucial state of his work, he directed against capitalism as a system of social reforms. Thus, Harris's usages of some term such as "class struggle", "marginalization", and "oppression of the oppressed by the oppressors", all falls on already dealt-with issues. Also, what Freire refers to as the 'banking concept', Morehead refers to as 'factory portrayal of schooling' or 'input and output analogy', Harris comfortably refers to as 'structured misrepresentation'.

Thirdly, as a follow-up from my second critique, Harris's in his fine observation contends that ideologies should be attacked, recognized, and its mystery demystified, so that people can be aware of some false consciousness whereby a person sees his or herself, and the world in a distorted was. This is due to his conviction that there is no escape from ideology, as we either live in one ideology or another. (p. 94) However, Harris after finally adopting the Marxist option failed to realize that the same Marxist position could be flawed too. According to Paulinus C. Egeh (2020), there are some views of Marx which are undesirable, and appears to be unachievable. He writes:

## International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp: (17-24), Month: May - June 2023, Available at: [www.noveltyjournals.com](http://www.noveltyjournals.com)

An example is his idea or aim for a classless society in which there will be no more conflicts, no more struggle, no more exploitation, no more suffering, no more poverty, everybody will live in peace. Of course, this sound so nice and wonderful, but can there be a society in which there will never be suffering, no poverty at all? According to Heraclitus, one of the famous ancient Greek philosophers, conflict and strife are the order of the universe. They are that which constitute things in the world. If one takes a closer look at the world of ours today, one would really notice that Heraclitus is right. Conflicts exist everywhere. This conflict is however not always negative. There are positive effects of these conflicts... (p. 118)

From the above statements, we can see a Marxist theory that has been attacked, and its mystery demystified. Harris, an astute scholar who in his enquiries concerning the prevailing ideologies of an ideal society chooses to adopt the Marxist social reform which is simply unattainable ab initio to contemporary studies of the history of social governance.

Fourthly, as echoed by Aspin in his writings reads:

Finally, the evident disingenuousness of the rejection of existing educational institutions- "the classrooms and lecture hall... as we know and experience them"—: and of their 'supportive rhetoric of titles and qualifications, while the author of what amounts to a plea to revolutionary practice in and against the existing *status quo* write this pamphlet from the position of senior lecturer within the department of a prestigious Antipodean university. (178)

From the statements of Aspin above, we see the background of Harris and how his thoughts negate his very foundation of learning. Hence, Aspin criticizes Harris on the basis that he shares ideas about the system in which he lives and earns his living to be 'open' to contradictions. On a final onslaught, Aspin asserts that in at least one, if not all of Harris' historicist paradise as a proponent, no such expression or opinion of his will be tolerated just as the "Lysenko affairs so eloquently demonstrates. Not only would Dr. Harris have failed his Ph.D... His book would have been banned or burned and he himself in all probability would have ended up in a psychiatric ward". (178)

Lastly, Harris' suppositions of class struggle by which his target is a follow-up of an existing Marxist discontent with the capitalist system, and his afterward adoption and endorsement of the Marxist notion of knowledge by production, still poses a setback. This setback could be identified in the form of "Solipsism". Now, Solipsism from the statements of Ogan and Ariche (2018) emanates from the Latin word: '*Solus*' meaning 'self'. Therefore, Solipsism could be said to be 'self alone' according to Ewelu, and 'myself-ism' in the view of Ozumba. The duo explains that from the epistemological standpoint, it is the doctrine that expresses only one's existence and experience that can be known for certain. (29) In our current case of study, it can be considered as "it is only my chosen idea, thoughts system or approved form of idealization that should be accepted to be the only truth". This Harris's projected model is what he believes should be accepted in the social classification of society. Therefore, every other social system should be discarded as it can at some point be known to be faulty or liable to fail. If this is Harris's argument, then he is not different from the inductivist and positivist he criticized in the early crucial chapters of his *Education and Knowledge*. This is because *Solipsism* will eventually lead to "*Subjectivism*" and of course, "*Skepticism*" which may as well lead to *Nihilism* and so forth.

## 2. CONCLUSIONS

The discussion so far has shown Kevin Harris's core convictions on what he believes should constitute the real sense of reality, especially in a social setting.

Harris' adoption of the Marxist position as a theoretical tool to counter the capitalist liberal democracies goes to show his dismay for what he refers to as the structured representation of reality. To some extent, one would want to share in Harris's position given the fact that the human mind tends to perform at its optimum capacity when it is left free to ascertain the truth by itself than when it is gagged hedged with certain patterns, traditions, or standards of thought. (Emedolu, 2010. 92) This form of manipulation of the human mind especially through the 'vehicle of education' as crafted by the capitalist system of thought is what Harris criticizes.

Nevertheless, the hallmark of this paper has been a critical evaluation of Kevin Harris's thoughts on education. As observed in the critical session of this work, Harris's acceptance of the Marxist position is seen to be flawed too, like every other standard he criticized. However, Harris's work *Education and Knowledge: The Structured Misrepresentation of Reality* deserves some accolades as it reveals some notable and salient points for both discussions as well as debates.

On a final note, the search for a more ideal educational model for social engagement that may stand as the right standard of operation for contemporary society(s) will continue to ensue. Even when it may seem utopic and impossible to attain, it will only be the driving force for an inquisitive mind to attempt the nearest unexplored truth as possible solutions to our educational and societal imminent challenges.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Adams, P. (2018), "*None but ourselves can free our mind*". <https://medium.com-a-longing-look/...815622625f1e>
- [2] Aspen, N. D. (1980). "*Revolutionary practices' versus philosophy of education?*" From A comparative education. "16 (2) DOI:10.1080/0305006800160208.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305006800160208>
- [3] Barnes, J. (1982), "*Aristotle and education*". <https://indeed.org/mobi/aristotle-and-education>.
- [4] Biko, S. B. (1987). I write what I like. Stubb's, A. (Ed.). London: Boweedian press.
- [5] Brumbaugh, R. S. (1970). "*Plato's philosophy of education: The Meno experience and the Republic curriculum*". From Educational theory. 20 (3). DOI: 10.1111/j174-5446.t600467.x
- [6] Ejeh, P. C. (2020) "*Analysis of Karl Marx's conception of society and individual*". From International journal of scientific and allied research (Journal of law and discipline). 4 (3). <http://www.mdcjournals.org.ij sar-jlad...html>
- [7] Emedolu C. C. (2017). Originality: A quest for philosophy of mental independence. 1. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt press.
- [8] Evers, C. E. (1980). "*Book review: Education and knowledge: The structured misrepresentation of reality*". From Australian Journal of education. 24(2). DOI: 10:1177/000494418002400210
- [9] Freire, P. (1980). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Penguin.
- [10] Harris, K. (1979). Education and Knowledge: The structured misrepresentation of reality. London: Routledge and Megan Paul.
- [11] Moore, B. N., Bruder, K. (2002). Philosophy the power of idea. 5th (Ed's). New York: McGraw-Hill
- [12] Morshead, R. W. (1975). "*The clash of hidden ideologies in contemporary education*". From The school review. 33 (4). DOI: 10.1086/443220
- [13] Ogan, T. V. Ariche, C. K (2018). "*A critical evaluation of Ayer's verification principle*". From Journal of good governance and sustainable development in Africa. 4 (9) <http://www.rcmss.com/index.php/ijpamp;www.academix.ng>
- [14] Patrick, Farenga (2008) "*The root of education*". In Everywhere all the time. A deschooling reader. Ed. Matt Hern. Edinburgh: AK press,
- [15] Peter, M. A. (2019). "*Interview with Kevin Harris*". From Educational philosophy and theory. DOI:10.1080/00131857.2019.1692481. <https://doi.org/1080>
- [16] Price, K. (1956). "*What is philosophy of education?*"? From Educational theories. 6 (2). DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-5446
- [17] Rusk, R. R. (1969). The doctrine of the greatest educators. 4th (eds). London: The Macmillan Press
- [18] Schmid, H. (1981). "*On the origin of Ideology*". From Acta sosociological12 (1/2): Sages Publications. <http://www.jstor.org>. DOI: 10.1177/000169988102400105
- [19] Siegel, H. (2020). "*Philosophy of education*". <https://www.britannica.com/topic/philosophy-of-education>.