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We had set out on our project of creating a model of education through which its telos would be served best. And beginning from first principles, it is the human being or the anthropos, we must start from. This calls for a deep philosophical understanding of our subject. As would be expected, when it comes to the human being, almost all philosophers have something to say. Also, several different cultures and peoples have their own ‘pet points of view’ and ‘set paradigms’ from which they would hardly budge. We decided that we would consult any author who would add to or contradict our thesis statement, no matter the underlying philosophy s/he espouses. The only test we applied was that of relevance. If something was relevant to our study, we would embrace that idea disregarding the school of thought that author comes from.

Two tendencies in educational practice, rob it of its noble telos: the mere ‘cognitive focus’ and the ever present ‘materialistic slant’, which we have considered in Chapter 2, ‘Contemporary Scenario: Domination of Idealism and Consumerism in Education’. We had traced these two tendencies, argued against them and now propose an alternative model, which serves as a useful starting point for educational policy and practice.
4.1 THE DOMINANCE OF THE MIND

The first tendency is the reckoning of education somewhat narrowly, as simply an exercise to provide inputs to the intellect. Jacques Delors, the chief author of the UNESCO report on education for the 21st Century says: “Formal education has traditionally focused mainly, if not exclusively, on learning to know” (Delors, 1992, p. 86). From the earliest times, the idea of education has been closely associated with our urge to ‘know.’

The human being probably first appeared in the present form, with the current cranial capacity, around 35000 B.C. as homo sapiens (Bowen, 1972, p. 1). The very etymology of the scientific name, homo sapiens derives from the ‘sapiential’ or ‘wisdom-oriented’, and signifies the ‘thinking species’ (Goleman, 1995, p. 4). It is no coincidence that the term, manas, in Sanskrit, corresponds very closely with the term, manushyan. The former term means ‘mind’ and the latter stands for ‘human’. All of these perspectives present the human person as essentially an intellectual being. The identification of the human with the mind is a world-wide phenomenon.

4.2 ANECDOTAL EVIDENCE

The ancient Indians are known to have highly exalted vidya and jnana\textsuperscript{64} – the varna system of Indian society, gave pride of place to the

\textsuperscript{64} Jnana is a Sanskrit word meaning ‘wisdom’. Jnana Bharathi, literally translated, stands for ‘wisdom Indian,’ Manas Gangothri means ‘the mind akin to the origin of the Ganges’, and Jnana Sangama would mean ‘confluence of wisdom’. Jnana brought the whole human person into the reckoning, not just the head. We posit that
brahmins, whose vocation it was to ply in knowledge. Also, the medieval scholastics are known to have made the pursuit of knowledge in their monasteries a highly-regimented affair and were training the young to interpret Christian scriptures. The tendency to associate education with pursuit of knowledge continues today, for instance, with Harvard University calling itself the ‘intellectual home’ of its students and alumni. We have also heard such famous teachers as C. K. Prahalad, the management thinker, who described himself as endowed with ‘intellectual horsepower’. Such phrases as ‘young minds’ and ‘brain-child’ in common parlance again show an intellectual bias in describing the human person. There is an elementary school in Bangalore that calls itself, Buddhi, or ‘intelligence’. Similarly, the Bangalore University is called Jnana Bharathi, Mysore University is called Manas Gangothri and the Visveswaraya Technological University is called Jnana Sangama. Notice the pervasive emphasis on the mind, which bespeaks of connecting education primarily to the cognitive dimension.

4.3 PLATO, ROUSSEAU AND DEWEY

The welfare of the state was the chief goal of the platonic worldview (Dewey, 2009, pp. 74-75). Education was an instrument in realizing that goal. Plato’s disciple, Aristotle, had put forth that the citizens of a state should be educated to suit the constitution of the state since wisdom is something required for negotiating life as a whole, the whole human person with the corporeal element is included in it. However, across time and cultures, wisdom has tended to be associated predominantly with mental/intellectual/cognitive capability.
(Heater, 1999, p. 171). The content of education in the Platonic model was derived by envisioning the organ of the state in which the individual would fit. Rousseau, on the other hand, had an individualistic agenda. His model included the protégé and the solitary tutor with nature as an agent of education. Since the exploitative feudal system of 18th century France was widely detested, the need for emancipation pointed Rousseau to the worship of nature as an alternative intellectual formulation for education (Dewey, 2009, p. 77). Nature became God for Rousseau and the child was best left to its care to bring about ‘spontaneous development’ (Dewey, 2009, pp. 95-96). Dewey skirted both these philosophers and as a creature of his times, he emphasized the democratic ideal in education (Dewey, 2009, pp. 73-74). All three philosophers had political reasons for putting forth their particular model of education.

Nettleship, looking closely at the anthropological aspects of the Platonic educational model, divides the human soul into three parts: (the sarx), appetitive, (the psyche) the spirited and (the nous) philosophical (Nettleship, 1935, pp. 11-16). First in the model, is the appetitive, which stands for the passions of the body and the material world, the world of commerce and mundane life. The appetitive is further divided into necessary appetite and unnecessary appetite, satisfaction of which does the anthropos good and evil respectively.

The spirit (or the psyche) is the second element, which stands for pugnacity and competitive nature. It serves the soldiering profession and grooms students into defenders of the city state of Athens. It has the quality of aggressiveness and is fostered by athletic exercise. It is the hard element in human nature. If properly nurtured, it inculcates bravery.
It is also the root of ambition and the competitive instinct. It can result in combativeness of two kinds: honorable rivalry or mere contentiousness. Overall, it is the source of self-assertion (Nettleship, 1935, p. 13) and can engender the ability to face danger (Nettleship, 1935, p. 13) without flinching. The spirit is the servant of the rational dimension in Plato’s metaphysics of the self (Nettleship, 1935, p. 16).

The final and the most desirable in the scale of worth is the philosophical or the rational (or nous), which stands for knowledge and wisdom. To know is to be fond, according to Nettleship, who describes the philosophical element in Plato’s metaphysics of education. The philosophical takes delight in something understood rather than in something familiar (Nettleship, 1935, p. 16). It has a love of order and quietness. Quick perception makes learning pleasant and welcomes every fresh form of truth. It has a natural impulse to obey rather than to resist. It employs persuasion rather than force. Plato identifies this philosophical element as wisdom (Nettleship, 1935, p. 16).

Society was divided into three groups and understood according as the dominant aspect in each person—the appetitive for the appetitive group, the spirited for the spirited group and the philosophical for the philosophical group. In the Platonic educational model, the philosophical is not just a complementary dimension (Nettleship, 1935, p. 16) in relation to the spirited element. It is rather the natural master. The philosophical has the penchant to know and understand; it is the substratum of gentleness; it employs reason and has the capacity for regulatory and ruling functions within the anthropos.
Whereas Plato seems to have established three overarching and
 discrete categories for the program of educational development (based on
 *sarx, psyche and nous*), Dewey suggests an ‘across the board’ approach
 with respect to the anthropological faculties. Hence Dewey saw a very
 intense engagement between the senses and the mind in the learning
 process (Dewey, 2009, p. 118). As has been discussed in Chapter 2,
 Dominance of Idealism, we all have the penchant to consider a ‘keen
 mind’ and gloss over the body in the learning process. The mind is
 severed from the physical organs of activity (Dewey, 2009, p. 117). The
 former is thought to be purely intellectual or cognitive, while the latter is
 an irrelevant, intruding physical factor (Dewey, 2009, p. 117). This is a
 flawed view. Let us see why. Consider the work of the muscles of the
 eyes, the vocal apparatus, the ears and the hand before the teacher at the
 blackboard (Dewey, 2009, p. 118). They are not simply conduits through
 which information reaches the mind (Dewey, 2009, p. 118). All of these
 anthropological entities play non-trivial roles in the student’s attentive
 participation in the classroom. They have an organic function in
 extracting meaning. Dewey gives the example of reading a book—the
 senses help read with expression and in extracting meaning as organic
 participants rather than simply as inlets to convey textual material into the
 mind. These sense organs need to be exercised and conditioned to work
 expertly with the mind in pedagogic activity. The connections are very
 intricate. Learning is an altogether organic process. According to
 Dewey’s anthropology, then, learning is made as much with the body as
 with the mind!
Dewey and Rousseau are rank contrarians with regard to the social dimension of education. Whereas Dewey considers the social environment to be a fundamental entity with great power to form the student’s habits and learning methods through interdependence (Dewey, 2009, p. 40), Rousseau contends that social conditions are not natural. He condemns the social thus, “Prejudice, authority, necessity, example, all the social conditions into which we are plunged, would stifle nature in him and put nothing in her place. She would be like a sapling chance sown in the midst of the highway, bent hither and thither and soon crushed by the passers-by.”65 The social aspect constitutes both the telos and the deontological aspects of education in Dewey’s conception. Besides a thriving, living, breathing social environment in school in Dewey’s model, he also considers the ‘out-of-school environment’ (Dewey, 2009, p. 36) important for the student to comprehend reality. This way, the student would not succumb to a pseudo-intellectual spirit but foster a social spirit that would help relate his/her learning to real and practical problems, touching people’s lives in existential ways. Students are brought into joint activities to collaborate and share their tools and methods to learn from their peers. Only this would beget desired social dispositions (Dewey, 2009, p. 36) in the student.

4.4 INFLUENCE OF RELIGION

Early history of education shows that it shared a lot with religion. We see in the second millennium (2000 BC to 1500 BC) that in the Babylonian civilization, “the priests considered themselves the guardians and conservators of knowledge” (Bowen, 1972, p. 11). Similarly, with the influence of Saint Paul, who, in the first century AD, used his Judeo-Greek erudition to articulate the Christian message, we see religion closely sharing ties with education. And even here, we observe the same scheme of the person holding sway – the body or the flesh\(^{66}\) standing for passions, and the spirit, standing for virtues like love, patience, faithfulness etc. It was also a time of expectation of the second coming\(^{67}\) of the savior and people tended to disregard life in this world to embrace that in the next. This gave rise to a kind of deprecation of the body, associating it with evil. This has had some unfortunate implications because the concept of the self now began to be associated primarily with the spirit, to the neglect of the body – the wholeness of the person was lost! Modern theology rejects this kind of deprecation of the body. Of all things, if the flesh were evil, why would the Lord Jesus Christ himself take flesh? This erroneous understanding of a kind of worthlessness of the body had deep undercurrents not only in religion, but in orienting education fundamentally to the cognitive, i.e. the mind. It took someone like Rousseau, to change that notion, advocating friendship with nature and legitimizing the importance of the senses. Rousseau strongly brought

\(^{66}\) The flesh is the biblical term for the appetitive body (Plato), Galatians 6:8, NRSV Bible.

\(^{67}\) John 14:3, NRSV Bible.
the counter perspective that the body, in fact, was good and essential to a healthy and comprehensive understanding of the person\textsuperscript{68}.

4.5 \textbf{INFLUENCE OF DESCARTES}

The French philosopher, Rene Descartes had an overarching influence on philosophical anthropology through his important statement: “I think. Therefore I am” (cogito ergo sum). His assertion divided the human person into two clear and distinct entities: ‘\textit{res cogitans}’ and ‘\textit{res extensa}’ – the ‘thinking thing’ and the ‘extended thing’ respectively. Although Descartes’ ‘cogito’ was a definitive declaration that saw the whole person in terms of a duality, it was not entirely new. We have seen glimpses of the same idea in ancient Greek and ancient Indian philosophy.\textsuperscript{69} All of these shared the view that among the two entities, the mind is somehow more important for the \textit{anthropos} than the body; that the \textit{anthropos} was fundamentally and ontologically the ‘thinking thing’, or \textit{res cogitans}. The cogito paradigm has had a strong appeal across the


\textsuperscript{69} In ancient Indian philosophy, we have the \textit{khandogya upanishad} (quoted in Section 4.9) indicating prime place to ether (or the mind) and relegates the body to a subordinate place. Also, there was the strong belief in ancient Greece that the body was a prison for the soul, which had committed some grave misdemeanour in the divine realm and was sent to the earth to remain imprisoned inside a body. Clearly, the ancient Greeks held that the soul and the body were two distinct entities just as Descartes had articulated in the modern era.
oceans and the generations, and it continues to be a dominant frame of reference for many schools even to this day.

A negative implication of this dualism in education has been that the body is considered as something that the child brings with him/her to school along with the mind (Dewey, 2009, p. 117). It is divorced from perception of meaning. It leads to a distinction between self and the environment. We tend to see our thinking, willing, desiring as having independent existence, removed from subject matter. We accord them a different set of rules of functioning irrespective of the energies of the environment. This is the reason for separation between method and subject matter. Dewey disagrees and explicates this through the example of food consumption:

It would be no less absurd to suppose that men can eat without eating something, or that the structure and movement of the jaws, throat muscles, digestive activities of stomach etc., are not what they are because of the material with their activity is engaged. Just as the organs of the organism are a continuous part of the very world in which food material exist, so the capacities of seeing, hearing, loving and imagining are intimately connected with the subject matter of the world. They are more truly ways in which the environment enters into experience and functions there than they are independent acts brought to bear upon things. Experience, in short, is not a combination of mind and world, subject and object, method and subject matter, but a single, continuous interaction of a great diversity. (Dewey, 2009, p. 138)

Thus, the senses play an organic role in learning (see Section 4.3, Plato, Rousseau and Dewey). The complete separation of mind from body is a tenuous idea. Kant, Berkeley, Hume and the whole idealist
school subscribes to this ‘mind-centered’ view. We shall be content with Descartes’ assertion here and look more closely at it in Chapter 5, ‘The Embodied Dimension’, under Section 5.1, ‘Descartes and the Cogito’.

### 4.6 KANT AND ROUSSEAU

Kant, the leading philosopher of idealism would claim that in the ultimate analysis, the human being is essentially a spirit and that the body is of no consequence. The mind is the entity that defines the human person. The rationality of the human person bestows upon him or her a solemn dignity. All reality is to be understood as the mind understands it. This is fundamental understanding of Kant’s doctrine of Transcendental Idealism: “I understand by the transcendental idealism of all appearances the doctrine that they are all to be regarded as mere representations and not as things in themselves, and accordingly that space and time are only sensible forms of our intuition…”70 The thing in itself or the *nomenon* cannot be known. We only know what the mind makes of it. This is the reason for the primacy of rationality for Kant.

The dimension of reason is a special gift to humankind. From Greek antiquity to our own times, the lovers of wisdom, the philosophers have cultivated it. The philosopher, David Hume, affirms that all things

---

70 Immanuel Kant’s transcendental idealism, which attributes all meaning to be derived through the exercise of the mind, is discussed in the *Stanford encyclopaedia of philosophy*. See http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-transcendental-idealism/
must ultimately be brought before the “tribunal of human reason.” It is universally applicable and serves as a basic means of understanding the world – one of education’s foremost tasks is to nourish the early life of the mind in the young learner so that decisions are well reasoned out. However, that is not the whole picture. Rousseau has a completely different view about the mind and body. He made a significant contribution to educational philosophy through his naturalistic theory of education, where nature has a decisive role to play. It appears that the body is the pre-eminent entity in Rousseau’s thought and in concordance with other naturalists, he gives the mind a secondary role. Rousseau just inverts the idealist position. He makes the startling statement that the mind is secondary to the action of the body comprising the limbs and the senses. The body is more fundamental, the mind is secondary:

Since everything that comes into the human mind enters through the gates of sense, man's first reason is a reason of sense-experience. It is this that serves as a foundation for the reason of the intelligence; our first teachers in natural philosophy are our feet, hands, and eyes. To substitute books for them does not teach us to reason, it teaches us to use the reason of others rather than our own; it teaches us to believe much and know little.

Before you can practice an art you must first get your tools; and if you are to make good use of those tools, they must be fashioned sufficiently strong to stand use. To learn to think we must therefore exercise our limbs, our senses, and our bodily organs, which are the tools of the intellect; and to get

71 David Hume gives a paramount place to the dimension of reason and predicates that all human affairs must finally be subjected to scrutiny by reason. See https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/h/hume/david/h92t/introduction.html
the best use out of these tools, the body which supplies us with them must be strong and healthy. Not only is it quite a mistake that true reason is developed apart from the body, but it is a good bodily constitution which makes the workings of the mind easy and correct.\textsuperscript{72}

In the human person, divided asunder by Descartes, as body and mind, Kant gives primacy to the mind, whereas Rousseau gives primacy to the body. Both are simplistic extremes and do not account for the human being in wholeness. To draw an analogy, insisting on the primacy of either one of these, viz., body or mind, is a little like insisting on only doing theoretical studies to the exclusion of practical application or vice-versa. It is easy to see the folly of such approaches—they are incomplete and fail to explain reality fully. The human person is neither pure spirit nor pure matter, but an interesting combination of the two, and it is in order to say that the human person is the union of soul and body. Only a comprehensive anthropological view can begin to understand the enormous complexity of the human being.

\section*{4.7 VIEWS FROM ANTHROPOLOGY}

The central question at issue in anthropology and for our thesis is: “what is the human being?”

There is a great list of scholars who have touched upon aspects of the human person. An interesting list (Mondin, 1985, p. 20) could be: rational animal (Aristotle); chained Prometheus (Sophocles); fallen soul (Plato); image of the logos (Philo); an image of God (Origen); rational

subsistent (Aquinas); a thinking reed (Pascal); mode of substance (Spinoza); will to power (Nietzsche); problematic man (Marcel); utopic man (Bloch); symbolic being (Cassirer); existent man (Heidegger); incarnate spirit (Scheler), erotic man (Freud), economic man (Marx); fallible man (Ricoeur); cultural man (Gehlen); mechanical man (Hobbes).

Let us take a few of the above for closer consideration. Aristotle, the Greek philosopher, was among the earliest who attempted an anthropological definition of the human being. “Two-legged creature”, he mused, but did not settle for it because there were certainly other two legged creatures that were not human – birds, for instance. He then said that the human person could possibly be called a “featherless biped”. This was perhaps acceptable because he reasoned that humans were the only creatures that were featherless and had two legs. Aristotle’s “Man is a rational animal,” was the best definition of man, because human beings were the only beings in the world that were animal and rational (Cox, 2010, p. 13). However, considering that human beings are most irrational at times, Jonathan Swift, the author of Gulliver’s Travels, modified what Aristotle said: “Man is an animal capable of reason”. More recently, some animal rights activists and philosophers have asserted that some non-human animals are also rational, placing Aristotle’s definition in question.

The human, for Aristotle, stands between the extremes of sensible and intelligible, unreason and reason, immanence and transcendence, body and soul (Varghese, 2007, p. 22). Aristotle professed the theory of matter and form. In Aristotle, body and soul are two distinct realities but aspects of the same greater reality. Accordingly, matter is potentiality and
form is actuality—potentiality is something that has a chance to happen, while actuality is something that is currently happening (Pasnau, 2002, p. 153). God is pure actuality. For Plato, there is a clear distinction between body and soul. He has a world of ideas and its antithesis, a world of matter. He contends that the soul comes from the world of ideas, is therefore imperishable and that it must have existed before birth. Aristotle bought into much of Plato’s philosophical anthropology concerning the soul.

However, modern theologians and philosophers hold that the human soul is not a particle nor is it part of a divine substance. The human soul is a created entity. Tresmontant predicates thus, “By this fundamental metaphysical thesis, Christian thought repudiated one of the most constant themes in the thought of ancient India and ancient Greece. The soul is created; it is not pre-existent to its body; it does not pass from body to body; it has not fallen into the body which is supposed to be evil” (Tresmontant, 1965, p. 72).

Philo of Alexandria also holds the dualist (Runia, 1988, pp. 71-72) position as Descartes – the human being is basically body and rational soul or mind. Both body and soul are created by God in Philo. However, only one of them is related to God. The “image of the logos” is his way of putting down his understanding of the anthropos. For Philo, all things were created by the rational principle or speech by God.

Origen, one of the early fathers of the Church held that the human being is essentially a soul and falls into a body. He considers the body

---

73 The *Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* states that souls or logika or rational beings were first created in close proximity to God with the intention that they should
as partially an outward manifestation of the soul and partly as a function of God’s providence (Greer & Von Balthasar, 1988, p. 12). There is a direct relationship between the condition of the soul and the condition of the body. Origen, in *De principiis*, does not make an anthropological decomposition of the human person but presents a functional definition of soul and body. The body is a sign of the fallen state of the soul; the greater the fall, the grosser the body. Greer and Von Balthasar conclude that according to Origen, the soul has brought upon itself a punishment by entering a body. Jean Danielou points out that Origen was one of the first to say that the body functions so as to send the soul back\textsuperscript{74} to God. From a particular perspective, the body cuts off the grace filled existence of the soul, whereas on the other, it is a vehicle through which God reveals himself and facilitates the moving back of the soul to God.

For the medieval Islamic philosopher, Averroes, the ‘human soul was formed of human generation’ and perishes with the body. The soul is not immortal (Regan, 2003, p. xxiv), which was in opposition to what Aquinas held. Aquinas agrees that the soul is spiritual and immortal. Aquinas also agrees with Averroes that the soul is responsible for all the vital activities of the human being, including those of the corporeal

\textsuperscript{74} Jean Danielou was a French Jesuit Cardinal and theologian who held Origen in very high esteem as the founder of the theology of the spiritual life and an initiator of monasticism in the fourth century. Danielou teaches that Origen was the first to propose that the soul is on a return journey to God. See http://www.copticchurch.net/topics/patrology/schoolofalex2/chapter01.html

---

\textsuperscript{74} Jean Danielou was a French Jesuit Cardinal and theologian who held Origen in very high esteem as the founder of the theology of the spiritual life and an initiator of monasticism in the fourth century. Danielou teaches that Origen was the first to propose that the soul is on a return journey to God. See http://www.copticchurch.net/topics/patrology/schoolofalex2/chapter01.html
dimension. Contrary to Averroes, Aquinas believes that each human has his or her own passive and active intellect so that each human soul is spiritual and immortal. But Aquinas validated his theory to his experience where the substance of the human being is a composite of body and soul and that the soul takes part in the exercise of the intellect while being completely independent of matter. His stance bolsters the Christian belief in the resurrection of the body, since the soul united to the glorified body will again be a human composite (Regan, 2003, p. xxiv).

The French scientist and philosopher, Blaise Pascal opines thus on anthropology, “Man is obviously made for thinking. Therein lies all his dignity and his merit; and his whole duty as he ought” (Levi, 2009, p. xiv). Pascal says: “Man is only a reed, the weakest in nature, but he is a thinking reed” (Levi, 2009, p. xiv). Pascal’s position on philosophical anthropology is extremely close to Kant’s assertion, both with regard to the primacy of the mind and the dignity of the human, owing to his/her ability to think for the self and thus to claim for the self a high order of dignity and merit.

Spinoza, the Dutch philosopher, contributes to anthropology thus: the human is called, “a mode of substance.” According to him, a substance is that which is “in itself and conceived through itself. A mode is the affections of substance, or that which is in another through which also it is conceived” (Garrett, 1995, pp. 3-4). Spinoza, in Ethics, holds that God is the only real substance. S/he is self-caused and has infinite attributes that include extension and thought. It is from this primordial substance that everything possible comes into being. It appears that individual entities such as human beings are but modes of this one
substance. Spinoza has an integral view of the human being; he does not approach the human being in terms of Cartesian dualism.

In the later part of Ethics, Spinoza distinguished between three kinds of knowledge or cognition. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy identifies them as: random experience, reason and intuition. Random experience is that knowledge that comes into the human mind as a fortuitous and haphazard encounter with things in the external world. They have no power to develop a strong viewpoint, but remain peripheral. They consist of imagination, random experiences, hearsay or knowledge culled together from signs. The second kind is reason, which is knowledge that is dependent on properties of things and the causal connections therein; and finally, intuition, is that knowledge that comes from an understanding of the essence of things. Reason is also understood as ‘adequate ideas’, which come into the seeker in a rational and orderly manner. It is the apprehension of the essence of things that are of a discursive and inferential nature. The object is situated in the nexus of causal connections and reveals the how and the why of a situation. The third kind of knowledge, intuition, is something ‘the mind apprehends directly in a single act’, without need for the ‘intermediate step of ratiocination’.

The 20th century French philosopher, Gabriel Marcel, characterizes the human person as “Problematic Man,” who lives in a “ghostly state of quandary,” and is obsessed by the nagging desire to possess rather than to ‘be.’ The problematic man believes that meaning is derived from the accumulation of possessions and projects his or her identity in terms of

75 http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/spinoza/
acquisitions made. A life is worth living only if it can appropriate more and more material things. Such a person identifies the self only by enumerating the material things s/he possesses (Hernandes, 2011, p. 4). The commitment to this kind of materialism is the fundamental source of all moral evil in our world, according to Marcel. This materialistic view causes one to see the other as valuable only for the functions the other performs. Humanity becomes a slave to objects and the slavery dissipates our ability to be moral agents (Hernandes, 2011, p. 5). As far as the person is concerned, there is an internal divorce of the self from the self and there is no longer a recognition of the person staring at the mirror. Existence then becomes a problem to be solved (Hernandes, 2011, p. 5)! Marcel characterizes the problematic man as one who is stuck in a “dull intolerable ease,” loses orientation and considers that this is all “some appalling mistake.” There is a great anxiety in such a person. The best way to come out of it is to begin with facing the anxiety existentially. Being part of a mechanistic, functional world, the notion of the self as embodied is lost. One is simply a cog in the machinery—I exist as an object among other objects (Hernandes, 2011, p. 9).

Ernst Cassirer, the 20th century German philosopher, propounded the philosophy of symbolic forms and called the human a ‘symbolic being.’ He is one of those philosophers who undervalues the body and over-rates the mind. He believes that the human person is not a receptor and an effector, which merely attributes a biological existence for him or

\[\text{Ernst Cassirer attributes more than biological orientation to the human person and understands him/her in terms of symbolic forms as portrayed in poetry, fantasy and dreams. See http://www.iep.utm.edu/cassirer/}\]
her. Instead, the world of the human being is full of symbols like poetical forms, scientific findings, emotional dispositions and logical arguments. Here, Cassirer claims that reason alone is not enough to fill out the canvas of the being that is the *anthropos*. Through a symbolic meaning attached to the human, he develops a way of life and contributes to civilization (Cornell, 2010, p. 6). The *anthropos* is a thoroughly expressive being. S/he achieves his/her own individuality in an ethical community constituted by laws (Coskun, 2010, p. 3). It is impossible for the human person to exist without these symbols – in the human enterprise, Cassirer analyzes major symbolic forms – language, myth, art, religion, history and science (Bauer, 2011, p. 2).

Martin Heidegger, the 20th Century philosopher, introduces the ‘Existential Man’. For him, the human is not just a thing that happens to be there in the world, inert with its physical attributes, but that the human is an ecstatic being, persistently calling out to be heard and recognized. The human being ‘exists’ means: the human is that being who is distinguished by an openness, standing in the unconcealedness of being (de Beistegui, 2003, p. 16). The human person is not to be likened to a subject who sustains the world—his or her stance is not that of a substance constituting the world. If the human being is thrown into the world, s/he is a pioneer, appearing at the boundaries of interchange with the world, where it begins to unfold and take shape. The *anthropos’, “being-in-the-world is an active participation, a dwelling, cultivating, caring and sojourning” (Van Kaam, 1983a, p. 169). At once, a part of the world, yet transcending it and projecting the self against a horizon of pure possibility, Heidegger’s *anthropos* defies description in few words. Existent man understands—to
exist is to understand, yet it is not a rational understanding of things or the use of the dimension of cognition to assimilate things. The very apparatus we use to understand in a rational way is considered a hindrance by Heidegger. The being-in-the-world is understood more through temporality as a possibility of being. These are metaphysical representations that need to be overcome for the essence of the human being to come to the fore (de Beistegui, 2003, p. 16). If the human understands, it is only to the extent that s/he is open to reality. Understanding is the very mode of the human being’s openness, the very way in which truth unfolds (de Beistegui, 2003, p. 17) for the human being. The existent man stands in the truth – the truth is his/her being and his/her destiny and essence. This essence can never be fully uncovered – even if physiologically the human is explored to the last irreducible element in his or her body, the essence of the human cannot be realized (de Beistegui, 2003, p. 18).

Heidegger, interpreting Descartes points out that since the res cogitans and the res extensa constitute the human person, the human being is connected to the world which is his or her extension. His understanding is that humanity exists in and through a relationship to the world. We are therefore neither a substance nor a thing, but an existence that understands the world—openness to the world defines our being, not thought (de Beistegui, 2003, p. 12).

In Heideggerian thought, the psyche and the soma are not two separate entities but a deeply integrated whole, and the being is called ‘incarnate existence’ (Leibliche Dasein). That the psyche and soma are separate entities and connected via the different Freudian drives is
rejected by Heidegger. Any dysfunction in the human being is not to be analyzed as belonging to psyche and soma separately but as one entity or being in the world (de Beistegui, 2003, p. 187).

According to Sigmund Freud, education was an enterprise through which students would get the important knowledge of mastering the body through the exercise of the mind. The body has to be molded to be a slave of the mind. There needs to be education for reason as well as education for eros. In Freud’s thinking, education would teach the young the ‘reality principle’ (Cullen & Wilcox, 2010, p. 21) and they should be taught to sublimate, repress and gain mastery (Carlson, 2012, pp. viii-ix) over the ‘pleasure principle’ (Cullen & Wilcox, 2010, p. 21).

Sexuality education has enormous implications. It is not only a personal issue but a societal one. If not managed carefully, it has the potential to bring much personal misery and grave public disorder. Sexuality education is important for the whole person. Endemic in our world is poor understanding of sexuality and most often the young get to know of it from the “gutters”. A great wellspring of sexuality knowledge is to be found in our scriptures and religious documents. For example, the teaching of the Catholic Church regarding contraception is to adopt ‘natural family planning’.

If a precondition to love is truth, which is faithfulness of each to the other, then Eros, which is sexual love, is to be a prerogative of married

---

77 The married couple that does not want to have children and yet engage in sex are exhorted to practice natural family planning by the Church. Here, sex is restricted to those dates in the 28-day menstrual cycle when the ovum is not yet formed due to which conception will not take place.
individuals only. It enables the giving of each other the _joy de vivre_ through an understanding way of engaging in sex. Students should be taught these basic tenets of sexual love and reserve it for exercise only in marriage so that the individual is healthy and community life is just and peaceful.

Karl Marx also had a strong view of the human being—he called him or her the ‘Economic Man’, who is pictured as the embodiment of selfishness, knowing no human fellowship beyond that which fits with an economic worldview. S/he is an entity whose only interest is wealth-maximization, driven solely by “rational self-interest”. His economic man was all flesh (matter alone) and there was no question of God or a transcendent dimension. Kenneth Arrow and F. H. Hahn put it insightfully as follows, “it is supposed in the main that ... the choices of economic agents can be deduced from certain axioms of rationality” (Brockway, 1996, pp. 9-10). Even nature has no place in economic man’s cosmogony! Marx sees the _anthropos_ as a member of society, a given class and as a captive of the system. His call to the laboring multitudes across the world was through his Communist Manifesto was, “Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains!” Marx believes that the human person’s full emancipation from his/her condition of deprivation should take place through an understanding of the forces that operate in society (Fromm, 2004, pp. vi–vii). Every human being is required to keep body and soul together and this is not always possible in a society that runs purely on goals of economic wealth-maximization. Even though the world has marched past the days of laissez faire capitalism to welfare capitalism, with a more merciful society in place
today, there remain great inequalities and deprivation that render the anthropos less human. Marx used to dream of the perfect communist state where the returns to labor are just as attractive as the returns from capital. As history has borne witness, however, it is not the individual human person as envisaged by John Locke that is the beneficiary, but a group of people consisting of the party, who plan and control the individual’s labor—their guiding principle was “from each according to his ability, to each according to his need”. This, of course, did not stand the test of time and we have seen the stripping down of communism in the collapse of the erstwhile Soviet Union and the entire communist bloc in Eastern Europe towards the end of the last century. Marx’s concept of the human was good in theory but bad, nay bloody in practice.

Another interesting way to think of economic man is the stark divergence in economic behavior within and across families. It is a Marxian way of life in the family, “from each according to one’s ability... to one’s need.” But outside of family-life and between nations internationally, there is always selfish bargaining. Wealth-maximization is the operative principle. Marx’s economic philosophy breaks down when applied to nations.

4.8 PITHY QUOTES\textsuperscript{78} ON THE ANTHROPOS

The Ancient World 700 BCE - 250 CE.

Both the western and eastern worlds reverberate with the same voice (Radhakrishnan & Raju, 1992, p. 31): The Ancient

\textsuperscript{78}Compiled primarily from The philosophy book by Will Buckingham, Douglas Burnham, Peter J. King, Clive Hill, Marcus Weeks, John Marenbon, 2010.
Greek aphorism "know thyself" is one of the maxims that was inscribed in the forecourt of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi. The Upanishads from ancient India also say ‘Know Thy Self’ (Atmanam Viddhi).

**Critias** (460 BC – 403 BC) an ancient Athenian political figure and contemporary of Socrates suggested that the mind is really blood around the heart (Radhakrishnan & Raju, 1992, p. 64).

Happy is he who has overcome his ego, **Siddharta Gautama**

All is one, **Parmaneides**

Man is the measure of all things, **Protagoras**

---

**The Medieval World 250 – 1500.**

The Soul is distinct from the body, **Avicenna.**

**Renaissance and the age of Reason 1500-1750.**

The end justifies the means, **Nicolo Machiavelli**

Man is a machine, **Thomas Hobbes**

I think therefore I am, **Rene Descartes**

No man’s knowledge here can go beyond his experience, **John Locke**

**The age of Revolution 1750 – 1900.**

Man was born free yet everywhere he is in chains, **Jean- Jacques Rousseau**

Man is an animal that makes bargains, **Adam Smith**

There are two worlds: our bodies and the external world, **Immanuel Kant**
Man has no gender, Mary Wollstonecraft
Every man takes the limits of his own field of vision for the limits of the world, Arthur Schopenhauer
Over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign, John Stuart Mill
Man is something to be surpassed, Friedrich Nietzsche

Only as an individual can man become a philosopher, Karl Jaspers
We are ourselves the entities to be analyzed, Martin Heidegger
The only way of knowing a person is to love them without hope, Walter Benjamin
Existence precedes essence, Jean- Paul Sartre
Man is defined as a human being and woman as a female, Simone de Beauvoir
In order to see the world, we must break with our familiar acceptance of it, Maurice Merleau-Ponty

Contemporary Philosophy 1950 – present.
Man is an invention of recent date, Michel Foucault

4.9  ANCIENT INDIAN ANTHROPOLOGY
Glimpses of the idealist philosophical viewpoint are visible in ancient India. The khandogya-upanishad also gives precedence for the mind. The mind is ether enclosed in the lotus of the heart, the palace,
placed in the body, the city. Here the body counts for very less, as it can
decay and is prone to passion and corruption:

There is this city of Brahman the body, and in it the palace, the small lotus of
the heart, and in it that small ether… By the old age of the body, the ether, or
Brahman within, does not age; by death of the body, that ether, or Brahman
within it, is not killed. That Brahman, is the true Brahma-City, not the body.
In it all desires are contained. It is the self, free from sin, free from old age,
from death and grief, from hunger and thirst (Muller, 1879, p. 125).

The Brahman is the essence of the human being—the mind—this is
the idealist position and has been evident in ancient Indian scripture,
where the primary ontic identity of the person is the mind (ether, here).

4.10 ANCIENT CHINESE ANTHROPOLOGY

Chuang Tzu’s wood carver depicts the way work is approached:

A wood carver made a post to hang bells on. When the post was finished, all
people admired it as a miraculous work of art. Also the Prince of Lu looked at
it and asked the carver: “What is your secret?” The carver answered: “I am a
simple artisan and do not know of secrets. There is only one thing to be
considered. When I was about to make the post, I was on my guard not to
allow my energy to be diverted by any other idea. I fasted in order to bring my
mind to balance… At this time, I did not think of His Majesty’s court. In this
way, I identified myself completely with my art, and all temptations of the
outer world had vanished. After that I went into the forest and looked at the
natural shape and growth of the trees. When I happened to see the right one,
the post for the bells stood ready before my eyes, and I could go to work.
Otherwise I would have failed. And the people hold my work divine because my innermost nature became merged with the nature of the material.” (Ulich, 1999, p. 28)

Our reflection on Chuang Tzu’s wood carver is placed as an example on how the anthropo-centered model works. See Section 4.12.2, ‘The Five Faculties in Consonance’ in the present chapter.

4.11 THE MIND AND BODY INDISTINGUISHABLE

The mind and the body share one of the most intricate connections – the human nervous system, which is connected to the spinal cord, is present in every tissue, organ and sinew of the body (Bittle 1945, pp. 43-65). We could consider the spinal cord as the extension of the brain and therefore, the mind. It may not be out of place to say that the ‘brain cannot be localized to only the head, but pervades the whole body itself.’ The brain and the body are interdependent and coordinate functions with each other for the ultimate benefit of the whole person! It is quite incorrect, therefore, to separate the mind and the body and give primacy to the mind in qualifying the human person. Further, this limited view of focusing solely on the mind is pernicious for education because it creates lopsided individuals – while producing cognitively competent professionals, who are skilled at their métiers, our educational programs also produce disturbed individuals who become educated terrorists, unethical doctors and corrupt keepers of the law. Could this have happened because their education trained their minds and not their
hearts? There is much truth in the Latin saying, ‘Mens sana in corpore sano,’ (a healthy mind is found in a healthy body).

Another definitive epistemological feature of the *anthropos* is the distinction between ‘percept’ and ‘concept’ (Bittle, 1936, pp. 223-227). Percept is that knowledge that comes into the human mind through the senses or the body. It is perceptual in nature; the human being perceives and processes knowledge through the five senses. It is concrete, particular and individual in nature. An example would be the process of recognizing a person. Perception will lead to remembering particular characteristics of that individual – his or her shape, size, color, mannerisms etc.

However, there can also be conception, in which case, the particular aspects of the individual are dropped and a process of abstraction takes place; the ideas refer to an entire class of people rather than a particular person. Such conception is universal, general and abstract. This is the second way knowledge reaches the mind, and is typical of subjects like mathematics or philosophy – it is conceived in the mind directly. Obviously, both kinds of knowledge are required in education. For a comprehensive approach to education, we must embrace both gateways, namely, the perceptual as well as the conceptual – including both the mind and the body, not the mind alone!

### 4.12 AN ANTHROPO-CENTERED MODEL OF EDUCATION, ACME

Various authorities have presented distinct ways of reducing the *anthropos* to elemental faculties. We list some here: Descartes, as we

---

79 See Chapter 6, ‘The Affective Self’ for discussion on the ‘heart.’
have seen, divides the person into mind (*res cogitans*) and body (*res extensa*).\(^{80}\) Plato presents the human person as comprised of body, mind and spirit\(^ {81}\). Dewey uses the terms, ‘mental’, ‘intellectual’ and ‘cognitive’ synonymously (Dewey, 2009, p. 55). The terms ‘affect’, ‘emotion’ and ‘feeling’ are also used interchangeably although some authors (Damasio, 1994, p. 145) prefer to give specific meanings. The terms ‘embodied’, ‘corporeal’ and ‘physical’ are also similarly used as substitutes. Common language also uses the terms ‘head’, ‘heart’ and the ‘hand’ to denote the respective entities. The document, *Gaudium et Spes* of Vatican II, understands the human person as whole and entire, body and soul, heart and conscience, mind and will.\(^ {82}\) The ancient Hebrew understanding of the human person is spiritual: “Man does not have a soul, he is a soul” (Squire, 1976, p. 19). The Freudian understanding is that the human is basically his or her libido, i.e., erotic energy—the body. In the explication of ‘libido theory’, Sigmund Freud proposed the existence of libido, an energy with which mental processes and structures are invested and which generates erotic attachments (Freud, 1962, p. 83). The Sartrean understanding is: the human is fundamentally his/her choices or will. One of Jean-Paul Sartre’s widely cited thoughts is: “Man is condemned to be free; because once thrown into the world, he is responsible for everything

---


he does.” Here Sartre essentially means that we did not choose to be here on earth but are at liberty nevertheless. We cannot avoid the obligation to choose and we have to do it responsibly (Burnett, 2006, p. 236). Note that these elemental descriptors of the person are internal to the human being. Another set of descriptors also includes external factors – for example, Kochar-Bryant and Heishman (2010, p. 4) put it as follows: the human being is in need of cognitive, social-emotional, physical and ethical development. The UK Education Reform Act\textsuperscript{83} of 1988 states that the school curriculum should be one that promotes the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils and of society. Heidegger would say that the human being is neither a substance nor a thought but an existent being with openness to the world in unconcealedness. De Beistegui opines that in Heidegger the human person is an integrated whole, and not separable into entities such as psyche and soma or mind and body (de Beistegui, 2003, pp. 12 &16). Other authors may view the human being to be composed of religious, political, social, economic, physical, mental, and emotional dimensions.

When we start from the very basics, we are likely not to omit any important facet. We get to work at a model and say something meaningful. As articulated in the opening statements of the Introduction, we place the human person or the \textit{anthropos} at the centre to build our model. Our attempt will be to understand the \textit{anthropos} to serve the \textit{telos} of education in the best way possible. Section v, Operational Definitions, in Introduction, denotes our subject as \textit{anthropos}, to signify the human

\textsuperscript{83} UK Education Reform Act, 1988, Chapter 40, 1-2-a, See http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/40/contents
person as the most unaccoutered and unsophisticated entity in need of education. In that sense, education begins the moment the child takes birth or even earlier at conception; it certainly does not begin when one is admitted into kindergarten. And here, we build the model of the *anthropos* based on the philosophies of the human person reviewed in this chapter and mentioned, more specifically, in the previous paragraph. We limit our discussions to the following criteria. First, we are interested in *internal descriptors*—the human faculties. Second, we consider the whole person and do not over-emphasize one or a few of the faculties as say, Sartre or Descartes have done. We might say that they were inclined towards just one or a few of the human faculties. We consider the whole person in his/her *comprehensiveness*. Comprehensiveness allows full expression and does not let glossing over of important dimensions, leaving them undeveloped or underdeveloped. This would mean that the various faculties should be distinct and well-defined; they should lend themselves to growth, which is an outcome of nature, and development, the outcome of nurture. Third, there is need for *complementariness*, which is a co-dependence of one dimension on another. Many phenomena are complementary: Matter and Spirit as constitution of reality; Emotion and Reason as modes of human engagement; Health, Wealth and Wisdom as ends of life; Hard-work and Prayer as ways of life; Mathematical Subjects and Theoretical Subjects in formal educational curricula; Firmness and Gentleness as attributes of personal style of management; The Absolute and The Relative as ethical positions; Nature and Nurture as ways of development etc. Fourth, there needs to be *relatedness* between the faculties. For example, one may take decisions at
the boundary of emotion and the will. The stronger the emotion, more perfect the will. Finally, there is need for context. Any situation has an associated context, without which utterances stand out awkward and inopportune. Engaging the different dimensions will yield that much needed context in the life of the anthropos at every stage.

Abstracting from these and satisfying the five criteria mentioned, the most comprehensive, the most differentiated and the model with the least overlap is one that conceives of the human person as comprised of the cognitive (mind, reason, rationality), the affective (heart, emotion and feeling), the conative (will, volition), the embodied (body, flesh) and the spiritual (soul, conscience). We thus have five distinct anthropological faculties comprising a comprehensive set. These distinct dimensions also function as fundamental descriptors of the human person. Improper or inadequate development of any of the five dimensions makes for an ill-formed person. The different dimensions of the anthropos are summarized pictorially in Figure 2.

---

84 Rousseau, in Emile: “Pure reason may lead us to approve or censure, but it is feeling which leads to action.” Online free eBook, http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/5427/pg5427-images.html
An Anthropo-Centered Model of Education, ACME

The Cognitive Dimension (Intellect)
Part of the mind that is ordained to the truth. Assesses, Evaluates, Rationalizes, Calculates, Compares, Extracts meaning from reality.

The Conative Dimension (Will)
Provides appetite for things Intellectual. In consonance with the intellect, takes decisions, motivates action, displays commitment and exercises authority.

The Affective Dimension
The symbolic heart is center of emotions and constellation of relatively lasting beliefs. Also considered the sensible, responsible center of personality, the core of the person where the mind and the body meet.

The Embodied Dimension
The complex web of entities in the organism that promotes harmony within and enacts what it is to be human.

The Spiritual Dimension (Conscience/Soul)
Spirit is the capacity for transcendence. Helps relate with God, neighbor, nature and self. Deals effectively with the reality of suffering and is open to the mystery of the ‘more than’.

**Figure 2.** A depiction of the Anthropo-Centered Model of Education, ACME. Each block of text above shows a particular dimension of the *anthropos* and its functions. Improper or inadequate development of any of the five dimensions makes for an ill-formed person.
The cognitive dimension of the person understands facts and figures, engages in rational thinking, makes calculated decisions, reasons through arguments and extracts meaning from chaos etc. The affective dimension of the person is the one that expresses emotions, feels joy, love, sorrow and shame. It is also the sensible, responsible centre of the self, where the mind and the body meet. The conative dimension lets the person exercise his or her volition, act with deliberation, exercise authority and stand by commitments. The embodied dimension is the biological organism, a complex web of internal entities that promotes harmony within and enacts what it is to be human in the socio-temporal plane. The spiritual dimension of the person promotes openness to life, and in a theistic context, enables trusting God. If the educational project is carried out according to the cognitive-materialistic scheme alone, we will have only a partial approach. The various functions of the person listed above get adversely affected with improper development of any of the five dimensions.

Anthropologically comprehensive education draws upon Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligences theory which addresses the mind (cognitive) and body. However, it goes further to educate the other four, viz., ‘the heart,’ (the affective), ‘the will,’ (the conative), ‘the soul,’ and ‘the conscience,’ (the spiritual) to make the complete human being. Soul and Conscience are considered together under spiritual dimension of the *anthropos*. We have put forth five distinct dimensions above—it is important to note that these are all distinct dimensions of the same self—
there is a many and one signification in the ‘five’ dimensions and the ‘single’ self of the *Anthropos*, just like the trees and the forest.

### 4.12.1 IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF ACME

From all that has gone before, we argue that neither the mind nor the body alone is fully representative of the ‘person,’ but that the human person is properly accounted for by all his or her faculties. The following are the salient features of our model:

i. There are five distinct and comprehensive faculties to the human being, which are listed above.

ii. The unit of analysis is the ‘whole person,’ or the *anthropos*, and not the mind or the body or any particular dimension.

iii. The mind acts both as one of the faculties and as a medium of communication between the external world and the other faculties, which are internal, except perhaps the ‘body’. As a dimension, the mind is capable of calculated rational decisions, logical reasoning, abstract formulations, creative thinking, passing judgments etc.

iv. Information from the real or imagined world enters the mind, reaches the appropriate dimension: the heart, the will, the conscience and it instantaneously leaves its imprint on the body. Information to each dimension appears in a different mode: to the heart it may be an ache or an ebullience or a sorrow; to the will it is an appetite to act and to the conscience it is an interior voice.

v. The whole person acts or responds after having received, processed and assessed information from all the five faculties.
Here, it may be opportune to recount scholastic philosophy, which made a sharp distinction between the ‘intellect’ and the ‘will.’ The primacy of either is the subject of ongoing debate. Arguing for the intellect, some would say that without the mind, the will cannot know how to act. Others, arguing for the primacy of the will would say that without the will the mind is impotent. While the debate rages on, we posit here that it is the ‘whole person,’ the *anthropos*, that is the most fundamental entity, and it is neither the mind nor the will, because they are just two among the five equally weighted faculties. The five dimensions of the *anthropos*, the body, the mind, the heart, the will and the soul work in complex ways to co-determine each other and aid the well-being of the whole person.

4.12.2 THE FIVE FACULTIES IN CONSONANCE

We shall consider three examples to illustrate the application of each of the five faculties, which shall also be referred to as dimensions to emphasize their distinctiveness. The first example is that of a student who undertakes a run for about 20 -25 minutes or engages in strenuous exercise. After this, his or her ‘body’ starts releasing proteins called ‘endorphins’ in the brain. They cause an ebullient mood and a feeling of relaxation in the body. This is an ideal disposition for study because the ‘mind’ is relaxed. The ‘heart’, the centre of passions and emotions, is unagitated because the relaxed body combats all debilitating feelings. The ‘will’ can be exercised with full volition because the ‘intellect’ has proposed good decision-making material through the calming influence of endorphins. The person can act with meaning and depth because s/he is
well disposed to deliberate decision-making. Finally, the *anthropos* can make his/her study a prayerful offering to God in an ambience of peace. The whole person is healthy. This activity is triggered through the embodied dimension and reaches a crescendo through the ‘spiritual’ one.

When we present the exercise of a particular faculty (dimension), it is the dominant dimension that is at work on that occasion in comparison to a less intense activity of other dimensions. Samuel Scolnicov, explicating Platonic metaphysics of education, makes an important point about the emphasis of different faculties in different activities. In the quote that follows, he contrasts the emotional and the cognitive: “[…] music and dance influence more directly the emotional aspects of the soul, since their cognitive content is less obvious than that of the verbal arts” (Scolnicov, 1988, p. 112). So, when we say that the embodied dimension undergoes exercises, it is not that the mind has absolutely no role in physical exercise, but that it is less prominent than the body in this particular activity.

The second example we consider is that of a person who devises a particularly immoral scheme in the ‘mind’. That plan may go against her/his own deeply held beliefs in the ‘heart’; s/he may wrestle with the ‘soul’ and finally decide to use the ‘will’ to nevertheless engage in the act; many years later, the voice of ‘conscience’ comes calling, injuring the soul, leading to continuous ruing in the ‘mind’ and causing bio-chemical changes in the ‘body’. Finally, the person becomes bodily-enervated. In extreme cases, the ‘body’ can succumb to diseases like ulcers, chronic backache, hypertension, clinical depression etc. This can be traced back to improper handling of the ‘will’ in the distant past. We see that the
‘will’, the ‘heart’ and the ‘conscience’ work together to profoundly alter the ‘body’, the ‘mind’ and the ‘soul’. It is only when the ‘soul’ experiences deep forgiveness that healing begins to occur and the therapeutic effects reach all five dimensions. The result is that the whole person regains health and mirth.

The third example would be Chuang Tsu’s wood carver’s situation described in Section 4.10, ‘Ancient Chinese Anthropology’, in the present chapter. Several things are worth reflecting on in the wood carver’s situation: first, there was total involvement of the whole person with the art. The wood carver fasted to bring his ‘senses’ under the control of his volition. As he saw the right tree in the forest, his imaginative ‘mind’ produced an inner vision of aesthetic form that gave him the vision of the invisible – he could ‘see’ the finished door post in the mind’s eye. Thereafter, his sure ‘hands’ felt the contours of the wood and went to work with the chisel, gimlet and hammer, his true eyes enabled him to maintain spatial proportion, ‘his hands and legs and his mind’ made measurements and calculations, his ‘conscience’ told him that he had a task of a higher order at hand and his passionate ‘heart’ gave him all the perseverance for the exacting, long-drawn process. He identified totally with his work! He deeply engaged his world, and was happy with what he had made. Again, the whole person is involved.

We could go on with more examples but the point about the exercise of the different faculties should be obvious. Further, the second Vatican council in its Declaration on Christian Education calls for
recognizing the ‘whole of the human’s life,’ and contends, ‘children and young people have a right to be motivated to appraise moral values with a right conscience (exercising the spiritual dimension in our model), to embrace them with a personal adherence,’ (exercising the conative dimension in our model). It is a partial approach to take up the anthropos’ development based on the mind alone. And sadly, it is paradigmatically preached and practiced by our educational world.

---