

Education, Not Indoctrination
Fallacy of the affordability of "Affordable Good Quality Education"

Unwilling enslavement by humongous student loans must not be a part of the right to get educated, especially if the goal of a higher, tertiary, education is to prepare a student to become a very sophisticated and constructive participant of a particular society, and not only another preacher of dogma through indoctrination.

The real problem arises when a student is done with his/her education, and afterward there is no intelligent way to repay these loans utilizing the knowledge and tools that one got enriched and trained through his/her education to use it later in his/her life. In this case the most serious problem arise in the field of a higher, tertiary, education because this is the one that is actually the most expensive. Just to add to this, there is another problem, which at first doesn't have that much in common with the student loan debt, but through further reading if this text I will show this connection. And it is why students, during their undergraduate and graduate education, are encouraged to think that the goal of their education is also to challenge the the systems to which they belong, when such acts will be severely punished as soon as one dares to do so, and further more, such an individual will be suddenly left on its own?

Those who are encouraging students to challenge the ills of the society in which the very same students live, and afterward leave them aside, on their own to suffer under the consequence of his/her actions, are engaged in the worst type of Hypocrisy and Doublespeak " ... Doublespeak is language that deliberately disguises, distorts, or reverses the meaning of words. ..."

Also, setting up values of a system on unrealistic footings represent the utter failure of the those who are building values of such a system. And those who support it by their dogmas intentionally and or unintentionally represents a total failure of the values upon which one wants to build the system which due to these illogicality creates problems I am going to talk about.

The problem arises at the moment in which the one, student or recent graduate, dares to challenge the true ills and not only those ills that are allowed by the dogma of a society. And if he/she does so, will be punished by the very sophisticated coercive system, in the case of the free market capitalism in the US, i.e., those who went through higher education will be controlled by the mechanism of the "financial aid," - repayment of the student loans. If one dares to complain about unfair nature of such a coercive tool, one is faced with accusations, "you took it, you pay it," totally ignoring the fact that world "of taking something" is not based only on the action of taking it, but it is also closely interwoven with the whole historical set of social-economical interaction that follow all the way up to the moment of taking a loan. In my opinion, historical set of social-economical interaction plays more important role then a mere act of taking it. But we do not question it, for it is a part of a dogma that is engrained into our "common sense" through all different variety of indoctrinations that are in play around us, and we are taking them for granted. So here we see there is no need for the prison, the system of student loans is quite good tool for coercion.

Now let me explain how this mechanism of "financial aid" is working.

If one is engaged in challenging the ills and dogmas of a society because "challenging the ills and dogmas of a society" was actually the part of his educational-intellectual training, i.e., how to recognize those social anomalies and address them in a most successful way, and at the same time, one does have individual source of the income that doesn't require him/her to depend of the system of "financial aid" that is provided by the system, then one is safe.

But one can also ask why is the other one safe if he/she posses the financial independence from the system of "financial aid?"

Those, who are forced to take loans are exactly the ones who doesn't have, to begin with, an independent of the mechanisms of the system (the system of "financial aid" is exactly part of the overall state system) source of income that can be used to cover the expenses of the education. So what does it mean? It means that only those who have already independent income off the system he/she is engaged with, wealthy ones, are allowed to critically engage with the ills of the system that otherwise is exactly the system who provides the financial assistance to those who doesn't have financial means to pay for an education.

We really have to be extremely naive, up to the point of stupidity to believe that the system that financing a student, will allow the student to be critically engaged with the system itself. Yes it will allow it in within the border of permissive parameters what is perceived through its dogma as a good thing to do, and we can see this through examples of encouragement, "... to encourage faculty and students to be bold, independent and creative thinkers..." " ...Meaningful and direct interaction with works of art encourages cross-disciplinary exchange, critical thinking, visual literacy and social and intellectual inquiry into connections between art and life,..." but direct, straight forward and truly bold actions and or statements beyond these indirect and vague meanings, will be censored and or punished.

The only ones who can afford to do so without a serious fear of the system, for they do not need to depend on the structural mechanism of the system that provides, as well, means for survival are wealthy students, and or individuals. Anyone else who dares to challenge any part of the system, i.e., the one that also provides financing education, system of financial aid, will lose his/her access to tools necessary for its existential need, well payed jobs. Through this action students and the rest will be discouraged from engagement in any serious critical discourse with the system in order to get allowed to have access to the tools necessary for providing oneself with the existential need and or paying off the financial debt acquired during education.

What is the connection of tool that provides oneself existential need to the tool for the providing the means for financing education?

After the education is over, a former student is suddenly faced with the obligation to start paying the student loans. In order for one to start paying loans, he/she has to get a steady, decently paid job that will provide him/her means to pay the loans, but this job also has to provide enough income so that the student can use it for providing oneself existential needs, and I am still not mentioning here, financial need for ones professional engagement in the area of ones education

We cannot play the game of free market of capitalism all the way up to this moment, and suddenly stop.

Education is a product as any other, it is only that we, or rather us as the part of the system, through its institutions of higher education is creating dogma where education is something more than just a mere product of a capitalist free market exchange of goods, this for that. But than if we want to define it with some other terms, as being something else than this simple exchange, this for that, why do we have to pay such a huge amount of money for our education, to begin with. How one can get enrolled in classes in schools, when in order to get enrolled, if accepted, one has to be able to pay for these classes, and under what circumstance one, who is considered poor – doesn't have income-wealth, or enough of it to pay for those classes, in the first place, will be able to pay for those classes. The only way one can do this, is to ask the system to provide him/her means for paying for those classes. And this system is called student private and or governmental loans. Now here we can see this hideous coercive mechanism in action.

Let me return to this idea of education as a product that we obtained through the most basic free market capitalist means, exchange, this for that, one gives money and in return get receives

education. And, I believe, that we all know if any of us goes to a store and purchases a good, and afterward one realizes that the purchased good is not functioning as advertised, then one has absolute right to get refund.

What if the product for which student paid by a borrowed loan cannot be utilized at all, to provide better life for themselves, the ones who purchased that education, nor they are able to acquire an employment that will provide them opportunity to pay for the school loan debts, and here I am not including covering living expense.

Does this mean that the product for which the student paid by school loans is a product that doesn't work, is malfunctioning, and as such the student, or rather, the former student should be allowed to return this malfunctioning item, failed education and get refunded?

But who can refund all those years one had spent in acquiring this product?

And what is the purpose of this product, knowledge, acquired through a higher, tertiary, education? Is the purpose of this product, the knowledge, to be used to utilize it and create product with which we can get engaged in a simple market exchanges, this for that?

If so, why a student had been encouraged through his education to utilize his tool to create product whose final quality is not to be successfully utilized through simple market exchange, this for that, but rather the quality lies in its capability to contribute to a greater common good. What a person can do in this case?

Here is an example one (1), a student has to have a source of income that can pay him his obligation toward a school loan provider. What if this source of income is barely enough to provide only for the expense of the costs of the loans, but the costs for life expensive cannot be met, for all income was spent to cover the school loan expense. So it means that a student must find an additional resource of income that will be used to cover living expense. Here, we cannot just say OK, find another job and there you are. Life is much more complex and to frame it in such a narrow window is really hypocrisy, at best.

What we do not ask, and I find it to be a very important question, is what is happening with this product, his education, for which he paid by borrowing money, known as the student loans?

Therefore, we must approach his/her education in the terms of the logic of capitalistic means of production and exchange, where actually any education is just another product circulating in this world of free market capitalism. It is only that those major apparatchiks (in the best spirits of professional functionaries of the Communist Party or government) of these institutions of higher education support the dogma, fairy tale, about the education in the US through their written text and or written word. And by doing this, they are upgrading the dogma where education is something more than just a mere product of a capitalist free market exchange of goods, this for that. But then, here is the major paradox, if we want to define this discourse in within these terms, as being something else than this simple exchange, this for that, why do we have to pay such a huge amount of money for our education, to begin with. Otherwise one cannot approach the education in the US as nothing more but a simple product.

But let me engage even further into this micro world of this coercive swindle known as "financing education" created so to provide "AFORDABLE" good quality education.

So here it is where I see the paradox. It starts when one asks the system to get provided with the means, paying for college, that will help him/her allow to get educated. Once one starts getting educated, and during this process one starts utilizing those sophisticated mechanisms acquired through knowledge in such a manner that there is no other way, if one is to utilize them in a proper mode, than to start to question and through very action of it, start debunking this system of financing education.

Now let me ask a question, what one can expect he/she will go through if he/she find it to be very important to address this system of funding of education, which he/she has debunked by utilizing the tool, the knowledge earned through his/her education, regardless the fact that exactly this system provided him/her means to get educated. It seems to me that the general system, through its parts, system of education, (providing the means for education to those in need - financial aid), expect the one who get educated to actually practice indoctrination, rather than education.

Otherwise I do not see any other reason why the one, who doesn't want to participate in indoctrination and or dogma, would be expose to such direct and or indirect harassment such as not have any opportunity to provide any creative environment that would help him/her in getting financial stability. If one practice indoctrination, than that one is practicing a dogma, and dogma is just another tool to create environment where the general system of relationship in a society is never questioned. And, of course, one would never get to the point to write what I am writing right now. And I can say it through my personal experience of such a system system. For instance while in school, in my direct contacts with professors at universities, or later throughout my experience in the search for employment, I had to hide the contents of my art work, and or to hide the association of my name with my work. This tells me that the system does not allow in any, and I am saying it, by any mean any serious discourse that truly debunk the system's ills. What would be those direct coercive means of the system? For instance placing one in a position of inability to provide not just opportunity but rather an environment so that he/she could create solutions itself for finding an intelligible employment for himself/herself in the field of its expertise in his/her area of academic training, that would provide him, all at the same time, enough of income to pay school debt, satisfy basic existential needs, and afterward provide some, basic, yet existent income for professional development.

Here we are getting to the beginning lines of this text where I argue against professing the ideas of what is to be the "role" of a student engaged in a higher, tertiary, education, at least, here, in the US, "a role of a leader who challenge, who push for the solutions through thinking out of the box, etc.," for I see that these professing are based on unrealistic values rather than what one can see that is taking place in our everyday experience.

Unfortunately many things play role and I just do not have enough time in here to discuss this matter in a very detailed and intelligent manner, for I have to get engaged in other physical and or intellectual activity that will provide me means of survival. But this activity as such will not provide me a space needed enough to address intelligently the subject of matter I am discussing here.