

Elements of the Native: Radical Pedagogy and Recovery from Amnesia

Kaustuv Roy

Azim Premji University

Abstract

This paper is an attempt to construct elements of a native pedagogy from the practices, truths, and relations buried under the onslaught of colonial modernity, a vicious combine that has mostly left the erstwhile colonized nations like India in denial of their own truths, native understandings, and deeper insights into life and purpose. In particular, the educational practices and values coming out of colonial modernity have been culturally catastrophic for children of ordinary folk who have had to deal with the tidal wave of monetary and market relations on the one hand, and a meaningless and alienating education on the other. The paper argues that it is more important now than ever to reengage with native wisdom to

craft a radical curriculum that cuts through the miasma and cultural deceit handed out as education to hapless children.

Modern mainstream education in general attempts to fit the individual into the world-apparent, that is to say, fit the person into the existing majoritarian conceptual model and representational schema of the world. In doing this, conventional curriculum takes for granted the construct called the “individual” as well as the construct called the “world” and does not seriously question these categories or the relation between them. In other words, the habits of thought by which the “individual” as well as the “world”

phenomenologically come into being remains outside the purview of education. Thus mainstream education poses itself between two unknowns that masquerade as known, as given. The result is unintelligent, to say the least, giving rise to endless crises and contradictions. In *Emile*, his famous treatise on education, Rousseau (1921) gives a scorching account of the contradiction:

I do not consider our ridiculous colleges as public institutes, nor do I include under this head a fashionable education, for this education facing two ways at once achieves nothing. It is only fit to turn out hypocrites, always professing to live for others, while thinking of themselves alone. These professions, however, deceive no one, for everyone has his share in them; they are so much labour wasted. Our inner conflicts are caused by these contradictions. Drawn this

way by nature and that way by man, compelled to yield to both forces, we make a compromise and reach neither goal. We go through life, struggling and hesitating, and die before we have found peace, useless alike to ourselves and to others.

But modern education is far more disastrous for those societies that have been subjugated either directly by colonial rule or through economic and cultural hegemony. Having abandoned their native understandings of, and equation with, their world, these societies have attempted or been forced to internalize wholesale the values, attitudes, and biases of their masters resulting in the peculiar beast called colonial modernity. This hybrid has systematically replaced whatever remained of native conceptions and relations with the world with a toxic precipitate called modern education that neither serves the “educated” nor the

society of which they are a part. Post-colonial studies have piled up critique after critique but achieved little in the way of working towards a different paradigm, possibly because they have used the master's tools to dismantle the master's house, as the saying goes. The task before this paper, on the other hand, is to go beyond critique and work towards a praxis that reengages with elements of native understanding.

Colonial modernity is a sickly combine. It is a transplanted organ kept in place only by means of suppressants and anesthetics. Just as the body's own immune system must be suppressed to keep in foreign objects, the first task of colonial modernity is to prevent the native or local wisdom from raising its head. In education, wholesale import of ideas and methods that keep failing comprehensively is the general order of things. One has only to visit an average school on an average day in any Indian city,

town, or village to see that such is the case.

This wholesale failure of education allows small pockets of triumphalist modernity to showcase itself in a miniscule minority who earn the skills to master colonial education and enter privileged institutions that provide the credentials for colonial style exploitation of the environment, the countryside, and the disprivileged. Meanwhile chaos prevails over the ordinary schools across the country, and young children remain in darkness about what education could do and was meant to do for them.

We educators, of the post-colonial era, are guilty of what we could have done but did not do. This is a double loss, for it is not only a loss of what might have been, but also the forfeiture of the new observational perch that the possibility would have afforded. This is what I call colonial *an-aesthetics*, and education has everything to do with it, is at the same time its parent and its child. Human

energies and education could have gone, for instance, towards preservation of life qualities, towards maintaining the ecological balance, towards a non-abusive, non-polluting way of life, and towards discovering the unique potential in each human being. Instead, following dominant and hegemonic cultures, we chose a ruthlessly totalitarian quality in the way life, reality, and relations are organized. With the tendency and borrowed technical power to shape and control the attenuated world through the ever same products, formats, lifestyles, terms, phrases, and activities, which create a kind of technological mask and linguistic web, we have systematically reduced the possibility of thinking the world differently, of imagining the world differently, of welcoming the world differently, and of leaving the world differently. The patterns of thought set through standardized forms of experience get

replicated through colonial style education that offers nothing but a way to settle down amidst the cultural ruins of the erstwhile colonized. The middle-class flag is raised and the reality-adjusted colonized subject finds nothing amiss, other than creature discomforts, and asks to be left alone to enjoy gadgets and trophies.

In any state of advanced decay, such as the education system in India, a dramatic turnaround is a romantic pie in the sky, but it is not unreasonable to hope for small movements here and there that dig deep into available light. What is being claimed is that despite all the talk of economic advancement etc., the prevailing thought systems especially in education have unutterably failed in either helping to bring about a reasonable human being or a livable society, and it is the task of thoughtful educators to come out of the current state of catalepsy and invent a new idiom that can deal with the

times without destroying what remains of livability. This is not about some arcane revivalism, but an attempt to engage subterranean pools of existing wisdom that are presently buried under the debris of modernity and its reductionist social imaginary. The present paper suggests that before we lose the public space completely to a marauding consciousness whose sole watchword is modernist exploitation of resources and instrumental aims like “skill development”, at least some educators might take a stance and begin a countervailing movement to bring elements of native thinking, and therefore sanity, back into the picture. Let us look at some of these elements and their relationships that might help us to visualize the beginnings of an alternative course of thinking in education.

In contrast to the outlook of colonial modernity, in native consideration, education was not the mere gathering of knowledge for

understanding, categorizing, and efficiently manipulating material objects; it was the very transformation of the human from a lower ontological state to a higher order of being.

In classical Indian philosophers’ view ‘education’ is a means of transforming human beings from a lower state to a higher state. Education must liberate small minds and transform them to universal mind. On one hand, it should take care of the basic needs of one and all, on the other, it should also show the path to move towards their ultimate goal of life. The ‘education’ which does not take into account the ultimate goal of life namely, a sense of fulfillment, is no education at all. In other words, ‘education’ must aim at transforming a man in such a way that he or she ultimately gets a feeling of ‘fulfillment’ or from

‘exclusiveness’ to ‘inclusiveness’. Transformation is understood as gradual ‘freedom from narrowness or bondage’ and complete transformation will mean complete freedom from all narrowness, conditioned state of mind, and identification of the universals. The classical Indian philosophers have identified that ultimate state as the state of discovering one’s own self. A true education must lead one to that state ultimately. No ‘education’ which does not do this job is worth its name (Jha, 2012).

One can see that the transformation sought through education is an ontological one. Unlike Western philosophy which has more and more side-stepped ontology and virtually put all its eggs in the epistemological basket, Eastern native experience put the ontological before anything else. Further, the possibility

of going beyond the exclusivity of the individual mind to a trans-individual inclusiveness is a bold experiment the promise of which is held out by several native schools of thought. For the rest of the article, I will present some of the useful transformative notions taken from these sources, which shift the focus of learning from the mind to the heart, and see the lighting of the inner lamp as the major purpose of education. Taken together, these constitute a useful ground for exploring what could be an alternative way to think and practice education.

Native wisdom holds that it is entirely inadequate merely to teach secular knowledge or knowledge about the outer world. Instead, knowledge about the world must be placed within the context of the central query: ‘Who is the knower?’ The knower cannot be taken for granted. And without this deeper ontological and

phenomenological query, objective knowledge turns against the knower and the network of relationships in terms of their real interests. To put it differently, knowing is easy, but knowing what to do with knowledge is a far more difficult, urgent and intimate task. Thus according to native wisdom, education must be prefaced and foregrounded by self-inquiry and a bridge must be built between the inner and the outer. This requires several kinds of psychic, affective, mental, and physical engagement and effort, alongside objective knowledge acquisition. It also requires many kinds of sacrifices that help create the “inner” atmosphere for proper reception of the outer. In the following paragraphs we will look at some of these concept-practices that have existed in native culture and that address some of these issues.

Elements of a Native Praxis

As such it is not overstating it to say that human beings are torn by conflict, at the individual as well as the societal level, history being a mute witness to it. We say that we are educating to bring about an enlightened citizenry but the educational process itself is geared towards turning out self-centred individuals who neither understand themselves deeply nor know how to engage with the collective beyond relations of exchange. The actions that come out of the fragmented grasp of things are there for all to see. We are torn between opposing impulses, striking up various compromises whose consequence is a life lived in contradiction. Education seemingly has nothing to do with the contradiction and conflict all around and the consequent reduced livability for all.

Instead, if living a life of non-contradiction, as Socrates (Scolnicov, 1994) demanded, and echoed by Eastern thought, is accepted as one of the reasonable goals of enlightened education then certain native conceptions which have been buried under modernity have something to offer. Among the native Indian texts, the highly popular *Bhagwad Gita* (2015), for example, has much to say about conflict and contradiction and speaks time and again of the importance of the state of *dwandatita* or *nirdwanda*, i.e. a state of being without or beyond contradiction. Unfortunately, the bosses of Indian curricula are too busy aligning themselves with international criteria, and hence such notions are not pedagogically explored, left at the outer periphery of the social imaginary. The idea itself is not difficult: a new quality of energy is discovered when the psyche renounces contradiction and the conflicted individual

moves towards a sense of wholeness. Pedagogically, in passage after passage, the *Gita* tells us how this may be achieved. The most radical of these directions is to *act without seeking the fruits of action*. This is a praxis in and of itself, and means that the motivation for action comes not from what action achieves but the intrinsic quality of the action itself, which, acting as a mirror, teaches us about ourselves more than anything else. In other words, the real “fruit” is in learning about ourselves. Pedagogically, if we do not know ourselves then all education fails to bring about the reasonable human being.

This is so different from what colonial modernity and dominate cultures have taught us, whose main focus is the fruit of action, and the bigger the fruit the better. The implications for education are immediately obvious. One goes through the curriculum not for the mastery of knowledge

but what the action of learning reveals about oneself, for the real purpose of life and the world hides in the being; the macrocosm is revealed in the microcosm. Knowledge acquisition thus finds its proper place in aligning the human being with ‘what is’ or the ontological state of the world. This movement of wholeness is truly non-exclusive and can therefore achieve the larger aim of education, which is to lead a life without contradiction. It also provides the right distance from the spectacle of cruel and mindless competition and acquisition in which modern education is mired.

However, a life without contradiction is not easy to achieve, especially in the ‘modern’ world, where a human being from birth is trained to become an avid participant-spectator-consumer of the existing economic and social order. That is to say, the task becomes complex when the very social measure of one’s life lies in contradiction. A

certain recoil from this man-made chaos becomes essential in order to be able to grasp again the threads of inwardness. So, alongside acquisition of conceptual knowledge, the native concept-practice of *tyaga* (relinquishment), as explained below, is crucial, which is the second native philosophical idea in which education could be grounded. The *Isha Upanishad* (2014) gives the strategy of “*tyaktena bhunjita*”, which implies limited partaking of the world while distancing it at the same time. That is to say, we receive into ourselves certain fruits of the world while maintaining a psychological distance, never giving the material and sensual more space and importance than is absolutely necessary to maintain life. The atmosphere of lesser is better has to be consciously cultivated in the educational environment as a countercurrent to the consumerist approach to knowledge and schooling. An embodied being has

material needs, but when these needs turn into wants, then chaos, suspicion, and war ensue. Needs can be identified and limited, whereas wants are manufactured cravings that have no basis other than indulgence.

The dividing line between genuine needs and psychological wants must be discovered through gradual unfoldment of our true relations with the material world. It cannot be achieved within the ideological apparatus of modernity. To prevent the overstepping of need into the arena of endless want and its justification, a deep inquiry into the mode of association with worldly things and images is needed. It is only through such careful inquiry a proper relationship with the material world can emerge and not by simply superimposing the idea of *tyaga* on existing relations. That would only result in hypocrisy and not wisdom. One must also guard against the shallow interpretation of *tyaga* as forsaking the world and embracing

asceticism, although that is one of its extreme possibilities. This kind of interpretation, especially in Western texts, has resulted in the shunning of one of the most useful notions in understanding object relations and the place of human beings amongst the things of the world. It is the task of education to work with this notion and make it operational in daily life as well as lay out a rich conceptual platform that allows each to work out her/his praxis.

The practice of *tyaga* cannot be carried out in isolation. It is concomitant to the simultaneous grasp of other related native ideas and practices that together form a whole. One such notion is '*ahankara*' or 'self' or 'ego'. Worldly grasping organizes itself around an empirical ego which is the centre of want. It is therefore of prime importance to discover for oneself the nature of this ego or self. If the self is ontologically equivalent to the trees and the rocks there is obviously little

we can do about it. However, if it is a different phenomenon than material objects then we must discover its nature and its relationship with things that lie on a different ontological plane. It is a demonstrable fact that if the human brain is cut open, we do not find the “self” anywhere. And yet it is the most persistent sensation contributing to the fact that it becomes the central unit of analysis in modernist thinking. The relevant question is therefore who or what posits the ‘I’? In other words, what is the inner process that makes the claim that ‘I’ exist? For Descartes (1986), the mere presence of thinking indicated self-presence. It is leap of faith not substantiated by reason. But within the native perceptions we are discussing no such leap of faith is required. Instead, the process of ‘I’ formation is put under careful scrutiny, not merely in theory but in individual practice.

Hence, the question arises: who is the educand, or what is it that is being educated? As remarked above, Western philosophy takes the self as given and works around this ontological assumption giving it unquestioned reality. Therefore education is provided to the ‘I’, fattening it and making it the central unit of social, cultural, and epistemological considerations. However, when this ontological assumption is absent, the nature of education changes dramatically. If there is no existential assumption about the central unit—the self—that is supposedly acquiring knowledge, then what is the function, purpose, process, and meaning of education? In other words, if education is not a laurel to be picked up by a transcendental ‘I’ then who is the learner and what is the site of learning? We can see that in such a case, the very plane of education becomes altered. It is the task of native education to discover the nature of this altered terrain and place the

hypothetical or contingent self in relation to it.

Also, it can be seen that when we do this, the tension between the self and society, the individual and the collective, about which so much has been written and debated in the West, disappears. It appears now as a false debate based on wrong categories and assumptions. Here a useful reference can be made to Nietzsche (1989) who pointed out that there were no actors, only action. Hence, educational theory will have to go ahead without implicitly or explicitly assuming an actor, and no thinker but a procession of thoughts. In order to be able to grasp the truth of this, native thought investigates another philosophical notion, namely, *sankalpa*, or will. If the self or ego, is discovered as a form of ideational superstition, then what happens to the will that seemingly directs human effort? Questions about will, especially 'free will', dominate Western discussions of

philosophy. However free will does not assume great importance in native philosophical thought. We see why that is the case in Ramanuja's (1978) writings:

The Supreme Being then entered [into each conscious being] being their support in order to realise these [powers] and He rules as one who permits [each conscious being to undertake the action s/he wants to undertake]. In this way, He remains the Entire to which all parts belong. Therefore, [each conscious being], having received the power [to think, undertake or cease an action], undertakes, ceases to act or [thinks] from himself/herself.

There is no free will other than the operation of divine wholeness which operates through all beings. The power to think and act cannot be evaluated other than by taking the sum

total of all conscious beings and their actions. In other words, we cannot understand this in an isolated manner or in relation to particular beings. The problem of philosophy is therefore not whether organisms have free will or not, but to grasp the point of entry and departure of that divine will that moves in us and to discover its real purpose. This is philosophically the true pedagogic act for it urges the native consciousness towards discovering the larger whole of which s/he is an integral part, and without an intuition of which we are doomed to live in contradiction. What does this mean in terms of education? Through relentless investigation of the relations between microcosm and macrocosm, the curriculum must allow the learner to discover the true nature of will. From a willful being, who foregrounds his own powers and desires, which nevertheless according to native understanding is a form of self-delusion, the student moves towards a

position of non-conflict between self and other. We can see how important this can be in attempting to bring about a peaceable and livable world.

The next related notion derived from native insight that is useful to consider here is ‘*samskara*’ meaning mental impressions and conditionings (*Mundaka*, 2005). In the popular idiom it means cultural beliefs, but it also denotes the social filters and organizers of perception, and therefore its great value for the native whose world is part mystery and part object. Its central importance from the perspective of education is on account of the fact that without understanding the processes by which mental representation of outer reality take place in us there is little hope of creating an adequate basis for learning about the world, instead there is plenty of scope for creating confusion and suffering. Cognitive formations are not independent of our background conditionings and residual

experiences that color our perceptions. This is more than an epistemic consideration; it goes all the way to the instruments of knowledge themselves. (Aurobindo, 2003). In a sense, the *samskaras* organize our representations of the world and we have to understand these through direct, unceasing observation. It cannot be understood by, say, reading a book about it. Further, conditioned reality has to be understood in order to go beyond the 'false' consciousness generated by residual affects, sense impressions, and particular orientation of receptor mechanisms. A life of non-contradiction, which is the aim of doing traditional education, necessitates an adequate understanding of the conditioned mind, its arising and subsidence. It is a process of slow and patient discovery that must be carried out by each one aspiring to be educated. One might even say that the entire effort of education is nothing other than to work free

of all the conditionings that limit our ways of looking and perceiving. Otherwise we become producers of *duhkah* or suffering, another notion important for our praxis.

Duhkah must not be understood in opposition to happiness (Rahula, 1959). All *chittavritti* or mental modifications, whether identified as pain or pleasure, ultimately lead to sorrow or suffering. It is not a selective category based on vulgar dichotomy. Philosophically one must locate the sources of suffering and eliminate them in order to lead the peaceful or non-contradictory life. The *Gita* (2015, Ch. 5) says, “*Ye hi samsparsha-ja bhoga, duhkha yonaya eva te, adi-anta-vanta Kounteya, na tesu ramate budha.*” Loosely translated it means that since all sensory enjoyments have a beginning and an end, they also bring suffering in their wake, therefore it is best not to indulge in the impermanent. In other words, the fleeting nature of sensory

experience always brings a sense of loss in its wake, and therefore suffering follows. In order to lead a life of non-contradiction, which we have said is a fundamental purpose of education, one must understand thoroughly the nature of sorrow and suffering. When the consciousness has learnt not to bring fresh suffering upon itself, to that extent it is liberated. This limited freedom brings new insights progressively. Individually as well as socially, *duhkah* assumes immense importance. When we bring suffering upon ourselves through craving and intemperance, we also affect others in the process. Suffering spreads like ripples on the surface of a pond in ever larger circles. Social violence, the result of incorrect understanding of the impermanent, is a clear example of how disaffect spreads to larger and larger groups from a point of origin. The systematic production of poverty and destitution through the ignorance and greed

of some is yet another example. Adequate education ought to show people to view the coming-to-be and the ceasing-to-be of phenomena so that we become less desperately attached to and dependent on phenomenal conditions.

Freedom from the existential state called *duhkha* also brings about compassion toward one's fellow beings (Gethin, 1998). That is to say, phenomenal understanding and even a partial transcendence of phenomenal attachment bestows us with feelings of deep kindness towards others since we are no longer caught up in our own suffering and do not look upon others as our competitors or as enemy. Hence educationally, the concept of *karuna* or compassion must be studied well. Compassion here does not mean ordinary feelings of sympathy, empathy, pity etc. Rather, *karuna* is a transcendental state in which the fundamental opposition between self and other, which is the main cause of

conflict in the world, is diminished. In other words, compassion is not a personal quality or individual attribute; *karuna* is not something you or I possess. It is a trans-personal phenomenon that comes about precisely when we are somewhat free of the claims of personhood. This releases the otherwise trapped non-individuated psychic energies for creating new relations on a creative plane. Compassion thus introduces the all-important limiting principle in human action, a limit on self-centred action that is otherwise missing. The lack of an organic limit is responsible for much of the chaos in the human world. *Karuna* or compassion is the other side of fulfillment, and the person who comes upon it has fewer dependencies on the outer world and hence fewer reasons for committing violence upon others.

I will end by mentioning two more native notions/practices available in vernacular Indian thought which I consider

invaluable for education, namely, *swasthya* (loosely translated as health) and *vyayama* (effort). Right health and right effort are two underlying prerequisites for native praxis. *Swasthya* does not mean mere absence of disease; rather, it means self-dependence or a freedom from dependence on the external conditions of life. One who possesses *swasthya* is relatively free from bodily disruptions and so can focus on her/his chosen path. For this a very elaborate code of conduct has been laid down in Ayurveda called *Swasthya Vrutta* (Frowley, 1997). *Swasthya* is a holistic concept-practice that attempts to bring awareness to every part of the body and the being including the knowledge as to what is needed to keep the different centers of the body-mind complex working in harmony. The effort is to find and function according to a rhythm natural to the specific being and the purpose is to reach the

life of non-contradiction which is the ultimate goal of human life.

Closely related to the above concept-practice is the idea of *vyayama*. The word comes from the root meaning ‘to uncover’ or ‘to extricate’. Effort is needed to extricate one’s true self or being from the distortions brought about by lack of awareness and training. The *Gita* (2015, Ch.3) says: “*Dhūmena avriyate vahni, yathadarsho malena cha.....tatha tenedam avritam*”, meaning, ‘as fire is obscured by smoke and the mirror is covered with dust’...thus is our true nature hidden from us. Right effort, like right health, is an integral notion aimed at bringing about transformative changes in various nodes and centres of the body and the being. In order to dig out of colonial modernity, the subject has to find strength at all levels to deny the path dependencies that have become ingrained in him as reality. It is the task of *vyayama* to create an adequate

vehicle for transformation at the physical, mental, psychic, and spiritual levels. As for the constituents of *vyayama*, it depends verily on the *sadhaka* or seeker and her/his constitution. Each constitution will require specific kind of *vyayama* for it to become a vehicle of non-contradiction. To give an example, some may require the discipline of *yoga*, and yet for others such exertions may be superfluous. Their *prarabdha* or accumulated past may require of them a different kind of effort. But one thing is certain, physical effort and physical labor is central to native ideas of transformative learning. Merely to sit and study books is not enough. One must be close to nature taking part in various activities of self-sustenance including the growing of food where possible (Gandhi, 1951).

Beyond Modernity

If the reader is concerned that most of the ideas and praxis presented above seem to lean towards the religious, I must hasten to clarify that in native thinking there is no clear line between the secular and the non-secular. This division itself is the product of modernity (Jung, 1970) that has created havoc among the autochthonous population. In native perception, the bundle of energy/consciousness called the human flows into things and vice versa through a variety of mechanisms, animisms, totems, rituals etc. Education can only participate in this cosmic exchange. Instead when education becomes directed at market relations divested of its cosmic angle, a large part of the native life is taken away replaced by dead things and dead relations. Then truly the native becomes the victim of modernity. As for the praxis, it generates a different atmosphere which is able to connect with the native psyche at an intimate level since it is one's own

subterranean pulse to which one is once more connected. It raises the level of being all around within which the curriculum becomes a living curriculum released from dead categories and deadening divisions. The praxeological elements move us toward a recollection and recuperation of innate sources independent of the oppression of the outer. One begins to become the author of one's own liberation.

It must be obvious that the foregoing practices are not for the student alone; the teacher must necessarily follow the above codes, precepts and practices at the same time. In other words, the praxis denies the usual division between teacher and the taught. A continuum is intrinsic to its vision. In the absence of the above, schooling and pedagogy will turn out to be, in Upanishadic language (*Isha*, 2014), a case of '*andhenaiva niyamana yathandhaha*' or the blind leading the blind. The praxis as outlined above must

be woven into the daily curriculum in a seamless manner with knowledge and the knower facing each other without hierarchy. In other words, who the knower is ontologically is just as important as what knowledge is epistemically.

In the above lines, I have endeavored, as briefly as possible, to delineate certain native concepts and practices that have transformative pedagogic edge, attempted to show why these are important and worth adopting for the decolonized subject, and demonstrated how such philosophical approaches might contribute towards coming out from under the colossal damage of colonial modernity. There are infinitely many other resources in the native philosophies for drawing out the living quality of education from the submerged knowledges and consciousness of colonized peoples. It is not my claim that these concept-practices by themselves can form a curriculum adequate

for today's world. They do not replace the learning of physics or chemistry or economics. Rather, these can and must form the background against which we place and make sense of empirical knowledge. It is also my suggestion that only when such frameworks are adequately built that knowledge finds its proper place and does not become destructive. Colonial modernity had stolen the possibility of simple and direct fulfillment from lives by teaching to focus exclusively on market and exchange relations. Those who could follow the modernist code and exploit successfully became the inheritors of the world. The rest are reduced to being passive observers whose world is systematically stolen from beneath their feet, each hour, every day. The key word today is 'smart'; one has got to be 'smart' and modernist education is supposed to teach one to be 'smart'. But pre-colonial native thought tells us that the index of a good human being

is not smartness but wholeness or non-contradictoriness. We want now to be able create an education that will give back to the ordinary human being the possibilities and potentialities that lie within her/his soul independent of mercantilist preferences and relations. It is a tall order given the circumstances of our times, but something worth attempting.

References

Aurobindo, Sri. (2003). *Early Cultural Writings*. Pondicherry, Sri Aurobindo Ashram Trust.

Bhagwad Gita (2015). English Edition, New Delhi, BBT Publishers.

_____ Chapter 3, verse 16.

_____ Chapter 5, verse 22.

Descartes, R. (1986). *Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy* 4th edition.

Transl. Donald A. Cress. New York, Hackett Classics.

Frawley, D. (1997). *Ayurveda and the Mind*. New Delhi, Vedic Books.

Gandhi, M. K. (1951). *Basic Education*. Ahmedabad, Navjivan Publishing House.

Gethin, R. (1998). *Foundations of Buddhism*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Isha Upanishad (2014). Transl. Prithi Nandy. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, verse 8.

Jha, V. N. (2012). "Classical Indian philosophy of Education", Conference proceedings, Spiritual

Heritage Education Network Inc., 2012.

Jung, C. G. (1970). "Civilization in Transition." In *Collected Works vol.10*. Princeton, Princeton

University Press

Laing, R. D. (1967). *The Politics of Experience*, London, Penguin Books.

Mundaka Upanishad (2005). New Delhi, Neha Publishers and Distributors.

Nietzsche, F. (1989). *On the Genealogy of Morals*. New York, Knopf Doubleday

Publishing Group.

Walpola, R. (1959). *What the Buddha Taught*. New York, Grove Pr.

Ramanujacharya, Sri (1978). *Vedarthasangraha*, 3rd edition. Transl. S. S. Raghavachar. Mysore,



Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama, pp.138–
141.

Rousseau, J. J. (1921). *Emile, or Education*,
Transl. Barbara Foxley. New York,

E. P. Dutton, p.17.

Scolnicov, S. (1994). "Plato on Education as
the Development of Reason." In *Studies in*

Philosophy and Education 13 (2), pp.
149-156.