Editorial

Authority seems to have no worry on the condition of Govt. Schools

Result of the Higher Secondary School examination conducted by the Council of Higher Secondary Education, Manipur (COHSEM) for the year 2018 was declared yesterday. The pass percentage showed a marked improvement from the previous two years at 73.83 percent.

The pass percentage recorded in 2018 was 67.04 while it was 68.81 in 2017.

State government education department is happy with the result.

There is reason for the state education department as the authority has successfully reduced the use of unfair means in the examination conducted by the COHSEM.

The result declared yesterday also shows that the number of students appeared from private run school have done much better than from those of the government run higher secondary schools.

In Science stream so students from government school can include among the top 23. Two students government run schools – one from Ibotonsana Girls Higher Secondary School and another from the TG Higher Secondary School mange to come at 6th and 10th position. Almost all topers are from the private schools. In commerce stream students from government school could manage to include in the top five rank. But overall, the private schools still continue to dominate the government school in terms of academic excellence.

This is not the first time that the private run schools are showing its credentials better than those of the government run schools but the last few decades showed excel of the private schools. There has not been a single year during the last few decades at which government schools showed its superiority than the private schools. It was always students from the private school like the Little flower, Nirmalabas or the St. Joseph school or Don Bosco School which top the High School Leaving Certificate examination in almost all the HSLC examination.

For the Higher Secondary Examination the government run schools were considered better some years back but with the emergence of some few higher secondary schools like Meci Explorer Changangei, Herbert School Changangei, Xtra Edge School Ghari, Comet School Changangei, Millennium Institute of Sciences Sagolband Kwakeithel Mayai Koibi, Human Resource Development Academy Ghari, Maram Don Bosco etc. it too is lagging far behind.

With the result which showed that private schools are doing better than the govt. school it definitely showed that there is something seriously wrong with the government education policy.

It does not make any difference when it is A party or B party which is in power, whwn it come to the education sector of the state. Since the coming of the new government under the Chief Minister N. Biren Singh, many promises had been heard from the education Minister Th. Radhesyam for improvement of the government schools. The first one year, that is, in 2017, people of the state witness the energetic education Minister inspecting conditions of the government schools. But even after half the year of 2019 has already passed and no improvement is being noticed to the condition of the government schools in Manipur.

Except for announcing of some cash awards to successful students who passed the Class X and XII with excellent marks in a luxuriously makeshift stage during a public function, nothing seems to be taken up for improvement of the education sector in the state. When the Delhi Government under the Chief Minister Arvind Kejriwal had given full priority to education sector by increasing the budget to 33% in 2015 from previous financial year during their regime, the state of Manipur allocated a meager amount to the education sector.

A welfare state is what every citizen expects from any government. And people of the country particularly in the state of Manipur promises by respective government about bringing a change is what has been hearing since the last many decades. Change of guard brings no difference to the condition of the state. Each party, whoever comes to power and ruled the state keep doing things for their own benefit in the name of making a welfare and progressive state. But in reality the situation of the state become worsen day after another.

Citizens of today know that education is the only way to build a welfare state and for that top priority is always expected. When said, top priority, it is about more budget, more strictures and more commitment of those in the power for improvement of the Education Sector. The more the people are educated, the dream for a welfare state will become reality. Without educated people, whatever, schemes or constructions being taken up will make no differences to the state of Manipur.

The Unintended Emancipation of Women in Satyajit Ray's Two Iconic Films

Courtesy The wire
By :Rehmat Merchant

In her claustrophobic apartment, Arati (Madhabi Mukherjee) of *Mahanagar* (1963), a denizen of the 1960s metropolitan Calcutta, and Charu (also Mukherjee) of *Charulata* (1964), in her opulent mansion in British Calcutta, inhabit different planets. The space where their worlds collide is in the unintended emancipation the women experience and the turmoil it creates in their marriage.

The forces acting on them and driving their destinies are different: financial need and market economics in *Mahanagar*; creative outpouring ignited by passion in *Charulata*. Whereas Arati's marriage is threatened by her professional success; Charu's is by her forbidden love. The times too contribute to their tryst: Arati is in a Calcutta where a working woman is not always a symbol of emancipation but an economic necessity. Charu, in Renaissance Bengal, is in a period conducive to her creative awakening. *Charulata,* also known as "The Lonely Wife" is adapted from Rabindranath Tagore's novella *The Broken Nest* (1901). *Mahanagar* is loosely based on *Descent* (1949), a short story by Narendranath Mitra. *Mahanagar's* opening shot, a screeching tram, sets the tone of the film – how ruthless a big city can be to its inhabitants. Though *Charulata* is caressingly shot – waltzing beams and ornate interiors – Charu's restlessness is established in the start: She's shown flitting across shutters following a random stranger on the street through her binoculars.

In *Mahanagar*, Arati has to step out to let in the physical (bustling traffic, jostling crowds) and emotional (husband's jealousy, ethical dilemmas) chaos. But for Charu, the storm literally blows into her house together with the figurative cause – the man. Arati, the lower middle-class wife of Subrata (Anil Chatterjee), a bank clerk,

lives with her small son, parents-in-law and sister-in-law in a dingy area of Calcutta. The preoccupation of this family is making ends meet – from evening chai to prescription glasses. Seeing her husband slogging away, Arati expresses her wish to take up a job (taking cue from him about a working couple). Though Subrata lectures her on how a wife's place is at home, overnight he turns pragmatic. Next morning he scans the newspapers, finds a suitable ad, prepares an application and guides Arati to the interview. And to her new destiny.In Charu's case too, it is her husband Bhupati (Soumitra Chatterjee) who is responsible for initiating her on the path to creativity and unwittingly discovering her latent passions. He asks his cousin Amal (Sailen Mukherjee), who's a regular house guest, to encourage Charu to write as he senses his wife's talent. Bhupati possibly acts out of guilt for the time he spends with his political newspaper and neglecting his young wife.Charu falls in love with Amal: an emotional awakening that ignites her creativity. She writes for Amal's admiration and attention – sharing her published essay with only him. Though Amal has let slip that it was Bhupati who wanted Charu to write. She still doesn't share her success with her husband; who is hurt to learn about it from his friends. Charu sees writing as a special bond between herself and Amal. But Amal rejects this intimacy by disregarding a promise made to Charu about not publishing an essay written in the notebook she had gifted him.In *Mahanagar*, Arati's husband is jealous of her economic success and wants her to resign. But when his bank closes down, he has no choice but to let her continue working. Arati with her empathy and nuanced intelligence is successful at her sales job. Her boss and self-appointed mentor Mukherjee (Haradhan Banerjee) recognises her as an asset to his business. Arati

performs because she wants to liberate her family from economic humdrum and help her husband. With her first salary, she gets gifts for everyone. (Unlike Charu, who sees her article as an ode to one person).

Amal takes on the role of a mentor to oblige his benefactor-cousin and enjoys it because his protégé is artistic and attractive. Though he is flirtatious (like in the piano sequence), he's careful to include Charu's sister-in-law in their conversations. But when Amal realises that Charu is developing serious feelings for him, he is uncomfortable.Subrato of *Mahanagar* is jealous of his wife's boss and drops in at her office to sense him out. But goes back reassured and with the possibility of work. Bhupati, on the other hand, has a trusting nature: As he tells Amal when he has been swindled by his brother-in-law that life is devoid of meaning if you cannot trust people. So he is oblivious of his wife's growing romantic attachment to Amal.

Where finding love makes Charu introspect on what she has lost, Arati's empowerment as the sole bread-winner brings out her altruistic side. She cares for her few-months-old Anglo-Indian friend and stands up for her. In a dramatic confrontation, Arati surprises her boss by taking an inflexible ideological stand on her friend's behalf. The confrontation scene is compact and even stifling, in the way the camera moves from Arati to Mukherjee – both passionately rooted in their point of view.

As far as marriage goes, the couple in *Mahanagar* reforge their bond eventually. Earlier, we have glimpsed the couple discussing their problems at night; suggesting an innate intimacy. There is a child, old parents and a sister who are a mutual responsibility. Towards the end, the old in-laws (initially bitter about her job) embrace their daughter-in-law's new found role.

In *Charulata*, the marriage is not glued with the social bond of any progeny.

We know that not being a mother rankles Charu (she abruptly turns away when a mother and child pop up on her binocular's horizon). Charu's family comprises an assortment of visiting relatives: her brother and his wife, and a cousin-in-law. This tenuous household is shattered when her brother defrauds and decamps, destroying the newspaper. Amol leaves too; not wishing to hurt Bhupati by his presence.

When Bhupati finally realises that his wife is in love with Amal, he is shaken. But an uneasy truce is suggested in the end by a frozen frame of their hands almost meeting. Perhaps the couple – as discussed on a holiday – will start a newspaper together that would have arts (Charu's contribution) and politics to rebuild their broken nest. The proposed publication could be the child they never had.

Towards the end in *Mahanagar*, Arati races down the steps after resigning from her job, symbolising her descent. So far we have only seen her take the elevator up. When she realises what she has done, she slows down. In her emotional distress, she meets her husband downstairs (who has come to meet the boss in the hope of job leads). Arati is afraid of her husband's response. But surprisingly, he is supportive of her decision and proud too. He tells her, jobs make people cowards but she had the temerity to stand by her convictions.

The movie ends with an unequivocal reconciliation. Arati looks around her and says optimistically that a big city births opportunities; to find one job should not be impossible. And her husband's rejoinder is why not two jobs. This clinches both the idealism of the Nehruvian era and a man's acceptance of his wife as an economic partner.We don't know where destiny will take the two women. But it is enough to know that Arati found her ideological voice and financial independence. And Charu was brave enough to love and write her heart out.

The Mathematical Significance of Pi

PIB
By : Daniel Ullman

Math students everywhere will be eating pies in class this week in celebration of what is known as Pi Day, the 14th day of the third month. The symbol ð (pronounced paj in English) is the 16th letter of the Greek alphabet and is used in mathematics to stand for a real number of special significance. When ð is written in decimal notation, it begins 3.14, suggesting the date 3/14. In fact, the decimal expansion of ð begins 3.1415, so Pi Day 2015, whose date was abbreviated as 3/14/15, was said to be of special significance, a once-per-century coincidence. (The same was said about the following year, on 3/14/16, since 3.1416 is a closer approximation to ð than is 3.1415.) Besides a reason to enjoy baked goods while feeling mathematically in-the-know, just what is ð anyway? It's defined to be the ratio between the circumference of a circle and the diameter of that circle. This ratio is the same for any size circle, so it's intrinsically attached to the idea of circularity. The circle is a fundamental shape, so it's natural to wonder about this fundamental ratio. People have been doing so going back at least to the ancient Babylonians.

You can see that ð is greater than three if you look at a hexagon inscribed within a circle. The perimeter of the hexagon is shorter than the circumference of the circle, and yet the ratio of the hexagon's perimeter to the circle's diameter is three. And you can see that ð is less than four if you look at the square that circumscribes a circle. The square's perimeter is longer than the

circle's circumference, and yet the ratio of this perimeter to the diameter of the circle is four. So ð is somewhere in there between three and four. OK, but what number *is* it?

A little experimentation with a measuring tape and a dinner plate suggests that ð might be 22/7, a number whose decimal expansion begins 3.14. But it turns out that 22/7 is approximately 3.1429, while even 2,250 years ago Archimedes knew that ð is approximately 3.1416. The fraction 355/113 is much closer to ð but still not exactly equal to it.

Fractionally Closer?

So this raises the question: Is there some other fraction out there that equals ð, not merely approximately but exactly? The answer is no. In 1761, Swiss mathematician Johann Lambert proved that no fraction exactly equals ð. This implies that its decimal expansion is never-ending, with no repeated pattern. The German mathematician Ferdinand Lindemann proved in 1882 that ð is, in fact, *transcendental*, which means that it does not solve any polynomial equation with integer coefficients. This implies in some sense that there isn't ever going to be a simple way of describing ð arithmetically. Nowadays, machines can compute trillions of decimal digits of ð, but that in no way helps us understand what ð is exactly. It's easiest just to say that, to be exact, ð is equal to ... ð.

No one knows whether each of the 10 digits—zero through nine—appears with equal frequency in the decimal expansion of ð, as we would expect if the digits of ð were produced by a random digit generator. This illustrates that a

strikingly elementary question can be out of reach of modern mathematics. Perhaps in a century mankind will know the answer to this question, but it's not even clear at this time how to attack it effectively.

Everything's Coming Up ð

What is astonishing about ð is that it appears in many different mathematical contexts and across all mathematical areas. It turns out that ð is the ratio of the area of a circle to the area of the square built on the radius of the circle. That seems like a coincidence, because ð was defined to be a different ratio. But the two ratios are the same. ð is also the ratio of the surface area of a sphere to the area of the square built on the diameter of the square. And what about the ratio of the volume of sphere to the volume of the cube built on the sphere's diameter? That's ð/6.

The area under the bell-shaped curve y=1/(1+x²) is ð. But this curve isn't actually the well-known and universal bell-shaped curve seen in statistics that has the formula y=e. The area under that curve is the square root of ð! If you drop a pin of length one centimeter on a sheet of lined paper with lines spaced at centimeter intervals, the probability that the pin crosses one of the lines is 2/ð. If you choose two whole numbers at random, the probability that they will have no common factor is 6/ð².

There are thousands of formulas for ð of one sort or another, although it isn't clear whether any of them will satisfy the desire to know what ð is exactly. One such formula is where the sigma symbol indicates that one must plug in all the whole numbers in place of the symbol "k" in the subsequent formula and add

up the resulting infinitely many fractions. What is remarkable about this expression is that it was discovered by the legendary Indian genius Srinivasan Ramanujan in 1914, working alone. No one knows how Ramanujan came up with this amazing formula. Moreover, his formula wasn't even shown to be correct until 1985—and that demonstration used high-speed computers to which Ramanujan had no access.

ð Is Beyond Universal

The number ð is a universal constant that is ubiquitous across mathematics. In fact, it is an understatement to call it "universal," because ð lives not only in this universe but in any conceivable universe. It existed even prior to the Big Bang. It is permanent and unchanging.

That's why the celebration of Pi Day seems so silly. The Gregorian calendar, the decimal system, the Greek alphabet, and pies are relatively modern, human-made inventions, chosen arbitrarily among many equivalent choices. Of course a mood-boosting piece of lemon meringue could be just what many math lovers need in the middle of March at the end of a long winter. But there's an element of absurdity to celebrating ð by noting its connections with these ephemera, which have themselves no connection to ð at all, just as absurd as it would be to celebrate Earth Day by eating foods that start with the letter "E."

This article was originally published on The Conversation. Read the original article. Daniel Ullman is a professor of mathematics at George Washington University.