SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Education, Society &Behavioural Science**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJESBS_13455**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Philosophical Examination of Liberative Pedagogy from the Perspectives of Solarin and other Liberative Thinkers**
Type of the Article	**Short communications**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment***(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	I will reserve most of my comments for the "general comments" section, as many of them are general. With that said, a few specific ones must be heeded for this paper to be worthy of publication. You can't have "etc." in an academic paper. Please get rid of all of them and simply be more precise in your language. The overall tone of the paper reads more as a polemical piece more suitable for an explicitly ideologically-laden publication, not a scholarly publication. The tone itself is a deal-breaker for this reviewer. I ask the author(s) to keep in mind that if s/he believes in these ideas, then s/he should phrase these ideas in a language this is accurate to get the point across, yet open enough to reach a wide-audience. Just one example on page 6 line 135-139: "In the colonialist axiological framework of values education, a Manichaean world-view of the dual existence of good and evil is erected whereby 'the settler paints the native as a sort of quintessence of evil' (citation) and as a corollary of a fortiori the settler imposes himself as the par excellence or paradigm of good." Everything about that sentence is discursively-laden and is not meant for a wide audience, but is simply a form of preaching to an already converted choir. It is also far from scholarly. I question the choice of "Manichaean." I question the quotation in relation to Manichaean. The Latin phrase is used incorrectly. This	This is noted. The portion has been recast to portray the proper context in which the term "Manichean" was "reportively" used.

	sentence is emblematic of the entire piece. Another example is page 4 lines 86-94. Google the word “aphabetamia” and see what you come up with (page 6, line 123). Organization: The organization needs to be crisper. What is it that you are setting out to do? Are you trying to elaborate on Tai Solarin’s conception of liberative pedagogy? If so, then simply say that, and then tell the audience how you are going about doing it. With that said, I question the authors you include to do this. I don’t think Paulo Freire can rightly be juxtaposed with the Solarin. Also, is there any written connection between the two? If so, that needs to be articulated. If the purpose of the paper is to better understand Tai Solarin’s form of liberative pedagogy, then perhaps it needs to be juxtaposed with a detractor of Solarin’s. For example, I think there are many good-minded people who would disagree that any connection with the works (not necessarily the writings) of Nehru, Mao, Castro, Lenin, and Stalin automatically challenge the notion of “liberation,” especially as liberation is connected in the West to *liberalis* (liberty). The author(s) refers to Tai Solarin as “Tai.” The accepted form is to use the last name, unless there is a specified reason for doing so. And if there is a reason, please specify in a footnote. The reference to Azikiwe as “Zik” is also untenable in a scholarly piece. The rationality of combatting violence with violence is	Basically, the duo's critique of the colonialist bequeathed system of education as utile for colonial domination and their advocacy for a liberating pedagogy for the oppressed constitute a binding ideologically cord between them. Solarin's "Our Grammar School Must Go" and Freire's “Pedagogy of the Oppressed" attest to this common ideological stance. Philosophically, Liberation as an ideology is capable of manifesting some contradictions. That these contradictions are the implied challenges in the realisation of the ideal has been discussed in the work. This will be modified accordingly. This will be corrected. This Fanon's option though "questionable" is not bereft of justification. Fanon demonstrated the rationality of this option as evident in this work. The themes attributed to Freire are rephrases of some ideas in his work- The Pedagogy of the Oppressed, and as a precursor we have made

	very questionable, and, should be included in the paper around page 8 where this is discussed. Pedagogy of liberation that teaches violence can hardly be considered liberatory. One needs no education at all to combat violence with violence. Many things are attributed to Freire such as an "exclusive nihilistic anthropology" with no citations. Freire does refer to "necrophilic" in his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, but this is done by borrowing from Eric Fromm. There is no mention of this in the paper. Pages 9-10 simply lists key terms, with no citations as to how they relate to the authors, texts, or overall purpose of the paper. This cannot be retained. There is only about two pages dedicated to methods and processes of Solarin's liberative pedagogy? Seems like more is needed. This reviewer submits that "secular" education is also sectarian. (See page 14, line 311.)	due reference to the pages of Freire's work where those ideas could be found.

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/Generalcomments	As alluded to above, this submission reads more as a topical essay in an upper-level undergraduate or graduate level course that in part covers “liberative pedagogy.” Its tone is quite polemical, and the style of writing is very discursively-laden, and disorganized. I think there is substantive work to be done to this piece before it is ready to be published in a Science Domain journal.	