PART – II
GENERAL LAYOUT OF PART II

Part II of this dissertation consists of a discussion of four anthropological dimensions in the *anthropos*, through chapter 5 to 8, viz., the embodied or the body, the affective or the heart, the conative or the will and the spiritual. The style is that of a formal discourse written in easy-to-read language. It attempts to bring the four distinct dimensions of the human self into focus.

After chapters, 5 to 8, we present Conclusion, which proposes integration in ACME, the working of ACME, some ideas for further research and a document representing a proposal to implement the Cornerstone Environment for Human Development, CEHD, a high school in Bangalore, envisioned in the light of this research.
CHAPTER V

THE EMBODIED DIMENSION
This chapter makes an argument for legitimizing the human body in education and traces its philosophical moorings. From very early on in history, in the ancient Greek and Indian traditions (khandogya upanishad quoted in Section 4.9), there appears to have been a tendency to assign a pre-eminent status to the mind and a subordinate place to the body. Plato considered the soul imprisoned in a body, thus assigning a negative connotation to it. This popular conception was philosophically revisited and reinforced chiefly by Descartes in the modern era. With reverberations in the educational realm, the student has not blossomed fully across all dimensions of human development. Knowing the body and cultivating the body needs understanding of the body – the personal, biological, social, religious and philosophical dimensions among others. We explore some of these in the present chapter.

86 There has been a strong tradition in ancient Greece that differentiated the soul and the body, understood in philosophy literature by the term, dualism. A material part and a non-material part made up the anthropos for the Greeks. Both Socrates and Plato were dualists. See http://fmmh.ycdsb.ca/teachers/fmmh_mcmanaman/pages/soul_body_summary.html

87 Ibid, “Every seeker after wisdom knows that up to the time when philosophy takes over, his soul is a helpless prisoner, chained hand and foot inside the body, forced to view reality not directly but only through the prison bars, and wallowing in utter ignorance.”
The human body is a very fascinating entity. Among all creatures filling the earth, it is the human who has a majestic, upright body (Mathulla, 2014, p. 323). The human commands the created order with his/her powerful presence – and a large measure of this presence is due to his/her body. Speaking of this presence, it is the ‘power of presence’, which encompasses ‘all of the body and all of the mind’ bearing simultaneously in a socio-temporal situation. A telling example of such presence is the instance of ‘psycho kinesis’ or PK, which is the ability to control inanimate objects by mental rather than physical methods (Francis, 2011, p. 95) through close proximity. An example would be the bending of a steel spoon without touching it. This is mind power acting through the body. A similar unexplained, mysterious phenomenon is ESP, Extra Sensory Perception. Clearly, there is more to the body than is immediately apparent—it has legitimate ontos in the human—we make several arguments in this chapter for the importance of the body and its seamless connection with the mind.

Pursuits undertaken by the human person in a lifetime can be abstracted as being, knowing and doing. None of these can be engaged in without participation of the mind, and neither of them is possible without the body. Can either the mind or the body exist independently of the other in the human person? This dichotomy exists only in theory; never in reality. The only issue before us then is: “Which is superior?” the mind or body. In the light of arguments presented in chapter 4 and other arguments forthcoming in the present chapter, that appears to be an irrelevant debate. They establish that the two (mind and body) cannot be
separated in a living being – they are interdependent, and together, constitute the whole person.

The human body is far more than an attribute of the person; it is more intimate than simply a physical appendage of the soul and almost defines a person. Even our day-to-day conversations betray this idea – when somebody hits us, for instance, we are more likely to ask, “Why did you hit me?” and not “why did you hit my body?” Similarly, if a felon were to shoot someone, the law would ask, “Why did YOU shoot him?” rather than “Why did your hand use the gun?” Similarly, we could have, “I ate,” and not “my mouth ate,” or “I played cricket,” not “my hands and feet played cricket” and so on. We might say that our bodies are too intimately connected to the question of who we essentially are. The mind and the body together constituting the whole person is the human being. The ‘I’ that we use for self-reference does not and cannot take only the mind into account – the body is equally part of the being. This ontological legitimacy given to the body ought to be reflected in educational circles. It is a great travesty that in education, we emphasize the mind far too much and give short shrift to the body. In fact, we sometimes go to the extreme of associating the body with positive evil. Among the first to condemn the body as evil are the Platonists and Manichaeists. Since the sex organs primarily differentiated the two genders, the condemnation was extended to marriage and conjugal life (Chundelikkat, 2009, p. 10).

5.1 DESCARTES AND THE COGITO

Rene Descartes, in modern philosophy, is considered a major proponent of the real distinction between mind and body as two entirely
separate entities. However, the ontological separation of mind and body in the human being was anticipated much earlier - in ancient Greek and ancient Indian philosophy. Descartes brought the new insight that viewed the body as part of nature (res extensa – the extended thing), governed by its physical constraints and laws, whereas the mind is not restrained by the elements (Grosz, 1994, p. 48). Descartes said: “I am a thinking thing.”

The body is akin to a self-moving machine, behaving in accordance with the laws of nature. It is akin to a mechanical device that functions just as other physical entities in nature, obeying the laws of logic and mechanics. The mind cannot be seen, whereas the body is visible. Since the mind is the thinking thing and the body is the extended thing, there is nothing common between them. One of them is the extended thing in space (res extensa), whereas the other is entirely of a different nature (res cogitans).

The mind and body are distinct and can exist independent of each other – that is why Descartes contends that they are two categorically different entities.

In terms of anthropology, for Descartes, the mind and the soul are essentially the same entity. Descartes divides the human being into the mind and the body and gives primacy to the mind. He made the famous

---

88 Plato was influenced by the prevalent and overarching Greek belief which viewed the body as a prison for the soul; having committed some grave misdemeanour in the divine realm, the soul was sent to the earth to remain inside a body. Thus, the body was considered the prison of the soul. See second footnote in the beginning of this chapter for quote from Plato.

89 Rene Descartes, Meditations on first Philosophy, Online eBook. See http://selfpace.uconn.edu/class/percep/DescartesMeditations.pdf
assertion, “I think, therefore I am” or Cogito ergo sum\textsuperscript{90} in Latin. Descartes was, as most of us are, a creature of his times. Skepticism and nominalism were rife in the Europe of his time and, the certainty about God became questionable. The 30-year war of religion, where Catholics and Protestants of Europe killed one another, and concluded in the peace of Westphalia in 1648, was a sorely disillusioning experience. This disillusionment gave rise to age of skepticism and uncertainty about God. Descartes used ‘doubt,’ the blood-brother of skepticism, as the starting point. He was looking for something like the ‘Archimedean fulcrum,’ upon which the whole universe of ideas could be turned.\textsuperscript{91} He found that the only thing that could not be doubted was doubt itself, and Descartes made a creative use of doubt. That point of absolute certitude or the ‘clear and distinct’ idea was found in the notion that he could doubt anything, but not doubt the doubter. Since he was part of the one thing that was certain, he, the agent, the doubter existed! And in answering the question, what am I, Descartes reached the conclusion that I am the thinking thing (Descartes, 1988, p. 25) or res cogitans. The human person was thus projected to be understood as primarily his/her mind, or the cogitative

\textsuperscript{90} The canonical formulation of the cogito reads, I think therefore I am. (Latin: cogito ergo sum; French: je pense, donc je suis.) This formulation does not arise in the Meditations. See http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/descartes-epistemology/#4

\textsuperscript{91} Archimedes, the Greek Mathematician and Philosopher, had famously said: “Give me a lever long enough and a fulcrum on which to place it, and I shall move the world.” The metaphor of the lever here may be understood as a powerful idea, on which Archimedes could found all other ideas. See http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/207927-give-me-a-lever-long-enough-and-a-fulcrum-on
faculty. Descartes’ cogito has been paradigmatic in qualifying the human person in terms of just one dimension, i.e., his or her cognition. Though Descartes was now sure of the mind, he could not be sure of the object with its extension. The subject is sure but the object is not. This is the famous “problem of the bridge,” which represents the conundrum of the mind and body being able to have common ground despite being two entirely different realms. On the one hand, we have the mind, which itself is mysterious and represents the subject, whereas on the other, we have the body, which is concrete in nature and part of the world, the object. There has thus far been no meaningful explanation to the bridge or the middle ground between the subject and the object, the mind and the body, and therefore it presents an unsolved problem in Cartesian philosophy.

Another argument92 used by Descartes is that the mind is considered indivisible. This is because it cannot have parts. On the other hand, the body is divisible because it can only be considered in terms of parts. Since the mind does not have parts and the body has parts, if they were the same thing, then we would have an impossible situation of something that does and does not have parts. Therefore, the mind and body are definitely two different entities, contended Descartes.

Princess Elizabeth93 of Bohemia, Descartes’ correspondent, presents the opposing argument that considers the mind and body as inseparably linked and completely intertwined. This is the view of our

92 The Internet encyclopaedia of philosophy discusses the reasons for and against dualism with Descartes and Princess Elizabeth presenting contrary views. See http://www.iep.utm.edu/descmind/
93 Ibid
thesis as well. She replies that the mind and body cannot be considered different because of the ‘mind to body causation’ phenomenon. For one thing to cause motion in another, they must come in contact with one another, like the cue ball to the eight ball in a game of pool. Thinking mechanistically, the mind cannot come into contact with the body, unless there is a common surface for them, through which the cue ball will set off the eight ball in motion.\textsuperscript{94} So, if the mind and body are entirely different natures, it would be impossible for the mind to will the lifting of the hand and set it into motion, when showing the direction in a street, for example.

A similar situation obtains in the ‘body to mind causation’ phenomenon. The perception of the senses causes an idea of the external world to be formed in the mind. Consider for example, the eye visualizing a tree and the optic nerve and brain producing an image of it. How can this image be formed, if the two are of entirely different natures,\textsuperscript{95} asks Princess Elizabeth?

These two counter arguments by Princess Elizabeth contested Descartes’ predication that the mind and body are really distinct and have nothing in common. In fact, the connection between the mind and the body is truly mysterious. The view that portrays that the mind and body have much in common and that the human person is a psycho-somatic entity shows that the two are seamlessly connected. This is also supported by the double aspect theory. All we can consider is the ‘whole person.’

\textsuperscript{94} Ibid
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid
The mind or the soul does not have any linkage to nature. This is the reason for the existence of the subject (the self) and the object (the world). The fact that the subject is distinct from nature is the basic prerequisite for all knowledge. The person being subject and distinct from the world gives scientific ideas their objectivity. It may be argued that for Descartes, the mind alone is linked to the foundations of knowledge and the body has no part to play in it (Grosz, 1994, p. 48). In Descartes’ view of the world, the mind occupies a place categorically different from the body, and being outside nature, it assumes a position superior to it. Since a person’s view is colored by his/her own prejudices, biases and idiosyncrasies, understanding reality would be indirect, inferential, deductive and by projection (Grosz, 1994, p. 48). However, that is only part of the story; we have seen in Chapter 4, under Section 4.11 that the mind and body are indistinguishable.

Knowledge enters the mind of the individual in two principal ways: the conceptual way and the perceptual way – it is characterized as ‘intellectual knowledge’ and ‘sense knowledge’ or concept and percept (Bittle, 1936, pp. 224-225). In the former, knowledge is abstract and general, applying to a class, whereas in the latter, it is particular and specific to a certain instance. In the former, knowledge is directly conceived in the mind and calls the imagination into play. As Livingstone (1944, p. 14) puts it, there is “pure thought”: “Pure thought led Plato in a wholly un-feminist world to say that women could and should engage in all activities of men”. Livingstone refers to Plato, writing The Republic (3rd Century BC), when women were proscribed from attending school, the practice continued in almost all the world well into the latter 19th
Century. In India, even to this day, certain villages follow this practice. However, Plato advocated women’s education about two millennia before it came to be accepted so widely. This idea was an instance of pure conception by Plato.

In the case of perception, the path way of knowledge to the mind is indirect, through the body i.e., through the senses that convey the perceived information into the mind. This is the dominant view put forward by John Locke in his ‘tabula rasa’, according to which the mind is the ‘blank slate’, and gets information only from the senses. Rousseau would wholeheartedly agree.

We posit here that both conception and perception are valid means of producing knowledge. To understand the whole gamut of intake of knowledge, we need both the mind and the body (conception and perception); not the mind alone. The internal sense, the intellect, and external senses, the five sense organs, should be healthful for ideal interaction with knowledge. Dewey (2009, p. 118) explains that the muscles of the external organs like eyes and the hands and the throat are not facilitators which act as pipes or inlets and outlets of knowledge to and from the mind. Rather, they are organic entities having instructive experience. Further, Dewey cautions that if these organs are mechanically employed without attention to synthesize meaning, they will remain mechanical habits (example, reading without expression and meaning) with very little application of intelligence (Dewey, 2009, p. 118). The integration of the intellect with the external senses is required for ideal learning.
Descartes de-emphasized the body and posited that even though there may be many drastic changes and alterations in our body, we would not lose the sense of who we are. This view may be contested by arguing that the body is apt to make indelible impressions on the mind when significant changes take place in it. Consider a lady who has had her uterus removed surgically. There would be an undeniable effect on her sentiments and emotional disposition – women can react to such situations in varieties of ways—from being morose to being given to despair, owing to a feeling that ‘some part of me is now missing,’ that ‘I am not capable of bearing children anymore,’ and that would affect her existentially—she would be a changed person! Or consider a person who has been through a terrible accident with the loss of a limb. This great change in the body, which directly affects mobility, would most likely lead to deep disappointment and would change his/her outlook in life forever. S/he too would be a changed person. The Bible also indicates a change of character and renewal of mind through spiritual processes and exercises – a new creation.\footnote{Saint Paul’s letter to the Corinthians reads: “So if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new!” Here, the change is total circumscribing the whole person, involving both body and mind. See 2 Corinthians 5:17, NRSV Bible.} Yoga, from the Indian tradition, also claims to produce a calm mind through yoga exercises and pranayama. Bodily changes impact the mind!

It may be pertinent to mention three related theories here: First, there is ‘Occasionalism’, which purports that among all causes and entities, there is only one true cause because there is only one true God.
All other natural causes are at best occasional causes.\textsuperscript{97} Applying Occasionalism to Cartesian Dualism, we could say that the mind-body and body-mind causalities present a conundrum in Descartes’ scheme of things. These two manifestations were used by Princess Elisabeth to argue against Cartesian dualism. Second, there is the ‘Theory of Causality’, which contends that all causes are responsible for some effects, that the latter are consequential in occurrence and dependent on the former\textsuperscript{98}. In a world brimming with causes, it could be argued that mind and matter are mysteriously connected in the human person to set off original causes co-determining each other. Third, there is the ‘Double-Aspect Theory’, which posits that the two realities, the mind and the body are distinct, but are inseparable and part of the same ultimate and one reality.\textsuperscript{99} It appears that Descartes held on to his dualist position with primacy for the mind but his thesis has got antagonists on both sides of the argument of dualism.

5.2 BODY IN PHILOSOPHY

Whereas some dominant schools of thought (Plato, Descartes, Kant) give primacy to the mind, there is a great tradition of modern philosophers who stand out for according that status to the body. The first was Jean Jacques Rousseau in \textit{Emile} (see Section 4.6) and Friedrich

\textsuperscript{97} http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/occasionalism/

\textsuperscript{98} http://www.britannica.com/topic/causation

\textsuperscript{99} http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/double%20aspect%20theory
Nietzsche in *Thus Spake Zarathustra*.\(^{100}\) We also have several twentieth century philosophers, like Jean Paul Sartre, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Martin Heidegger and Michel Foucault, pursuing this line of thought.

Rousseau advocated friendship with nature and legitimized the importance of the senses and located wisdom in the healthy and proper use of the senses ("[…] To learn to think we must therefore exercise our limbs, our senses, and our bodily organs, which are the tools of the intellect […]", see Section 4.6 for complete quote from *Emile* by Rousseau). He strongly brought the counter perspective that the body was, in fact, good and essential to a healthy and comprehensive understanding of the person. Nietzsche also championed the legitimacy of the body—like Rousseau, he proposed ‘embodied reason,’ (Besley, 2006, p. 31) locating the ability to reason in the body rather than the mind, and was an opponent of mind/body dualist scheme with primacy for the mind, enunciated by Descartes. Nietzsche famously said: “[T]here is more reason in your body than in your best wisdom” (Benson, 2007, p. 63). Besley adds that embodied reason enables taking control of one’s passions by efficient control of one’s body. Like Rousseau, Nietzsche saw the body as a great intelligence. The human being acts through the intelligence of his body, reconciling the various conflicts and divisive instincts within it.

Jean Paul Sartre was another philosopher, who buoyed up the body. Sartre is famous for the insight, “Existence precedes essence.” Just ‘to be’ (to exist) was more important than knowing about the characteristics

\(^{100}\) “There is more reason in your body than in your best wisdom” See http://philosophy.stackexchange.com
of a person. This is a central principle of existentialism that argues for precedence for ‘existence’ as a person. The idea of qualities of the person depicting his or her nature is a subordinate concern for Sartre. This is in radical departure from medieval philosophy that held the exact opposite view. It considered knowing the essence about an entity or of understanding its nature to be more important than the existence of the entity itself. Sartre’s explanation of existence would straightaway imply that in the case of the human person, the body is the first dimension of being.

Maurice Merleau-Ponty brought the notion of the “lived experience”\textsuperscript{101} and “embodied perception,”\textsuperscript{102} giving primacy to the senses, which perceive the world as it is, rather than through the subjectivity of the mind. The body in the lived experience is a very special entity, in that, it both, touches and is touched (Merleau-Ponty, 2002, p. 93). Ponty also puts forward the thought that our ideas and intentions are displayed in the natural and pre-predicative interactions with the world around us by which our bodily life of desires, habits and evaluations are affected. These pre-predicative bodily perceptions provide the text of philosophical descriptions and the genesis of a more authentic and richer meaning of rationality (Glendinning, 1999, p. 311). Ponty goes further and implies that the mind and the body cannot be neatly separated as subject and object, transcendent and immanent. This


\textsuperscript{102} Ibid
would mean that there would be unity between mind and body. They are too intimate to be torn asunder; only death can do that. The body is the means by which the world outside is accessed. In his *Phenomenology of Perception*, Merleau Ponty argues that the body is not an object like any other (Glendinning, 1999, p. 311). Also, the body’s relations with the world are not one of cause and effect or of the logical positivist kind. It has its own lived experience and story to tell with its tensions, conflicts and resolutions. Ponty would imply that meaning originates in the body. The body’s relations are informed by meanings: ‘Because we are in the world, we are condemned to meanings’ (Glendinning, 1999, p. 311).

It is not possible for us to stand outside our own body and observe it because the body is the means by which our perspective comes into being. A Chinese saying goes, “If you want to know what water is like, don’t ask the fish” because the fish is in the water and it is through the water that the perspective of the fish comes into being – the fish cannot say anything objective about the water. A great implication of this is that we have at best, only a partial understanding of things. We cannot know them absolutely (Fraser & Greco, 2005, pp. 43-34). Kant would support the view by asserting that we cannot know things in themselves (nomenon) but only as they appear to us (phenomenon).103

103 Note from *Encyclopaedia britannica*: “In the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, the thing-in-itself (das Ding an sich) as opposed to what Kant called the phenomenon—the thing as it appears to an observer. Though the nomena holds the contents of the intelligible world, Kant claimed that man’s speculative reason can only know phenomena and can never penetrate to the noumenon.” See http://www.britannica.com/topic/thing-in-itself
There is an interesting argument that connects the human body to animal bodies: The difference between the two is only in degree and not in kind. The physiological arrangement of animal bodies and the human body show a fundamental continuity (Grosz, 1994, p. 50). There cannot be a qualitative distinction between the two. This further bolsters Descartes’ argument that the human body is like any other animal’s body, “both animal and human bodies can be best understood to be ‘machine[s] made of earth, which God forms.’” There is a distinction Descartes makes between human and animal souls, predicking that animals do not have souls. The bodies however have some commonalities, belonging as they are, to the mundane, terrestrial order, and are the extended thing (res extensa). What is very different is the soul, the mind, the conscience and consciousness that drive the human body, giving it perspective and a point of view, which is a very human and rational attribute, and which has the ability to use language.

Among the many objections to the Cartesian model, which relegates the body to a place with brute nature, there is the fact that the body can ‘feel’ the objective world out there: this is the felt body or as Sheets Johnston put it, the ‘somatically felt body.’ Would this not mean that the body and the mind operate together to make sense of the objective world when it is felt by the body? Here is another reason for

104 http://www.iep.utm.edu/descarte/#SH8d
105 Ibid
106 Ibid

187
viewing the mind and body as seamlessly and intimately connected, and impossible to separate. The so-called mind-body dichotomy is a faulty premise that does not exist - it is a pseudo problem; only the whole person exists!

5.3 BODY IN RELIGION

The Biblical complementariness\(^{108}\) of the human body of Adam and Eve, male and female, tell us that human genders are each different and made for the other. The overwhelming majority of relationships in the world reflect this reality. In Jewish thought, the body is the “soul in its outward form” (Newell, 2002b, p. vii). Newell opines that the body is here on earth for a while and soon passes off like an echo: “[The Body] is born and dies, and in that sense, is passing like an echo, but carries within it the sounds of the eternal” (Newell, 2002b, p. vii). Also, we have the poet William Blake calling the body a ‘portion of the soul’ (Blake, 1988, p. 34). John Scotus, the Irish philosopher, also calls the body the ‘echo of the soul’ (Newell, 2002a, p. 1). In Christian thought, the body is considered the ‘temple of the Holy Spirit’\(^{109}\).

---

\(^{108}\) ‘Male and female he created them’, Genesis 1:27, NRSV Bible. This verse may be interpreted as differentiating the two kinds of humans fundamentally at the bodily level – a part of Christian Anthropology.

\(^{109}\) “Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God?” 1 Corinthians 6:19, NRSV Bible.
Christians are exhorted to keep a pure body, which is a prerequisite for spiritual worship. For Saint Paul, keeping a pure body, untouched by intoxicants and undefiled by promiscuity is holiness. Sex has a proper place for the human being in marriage and only in marriage. Genesis 2:24 underscores this, ‘[F]or this reason, a man shall leave his father and mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh.’ Uniting in body by the married couple brings them a new freedom and a profound intimacy, which is derived from God. Chundelikkat, in *Theology of the Body in John Paul II*, portrays the aspect of sexual intimacy in a very beautiful way: “Oneness implies the willingness to reveal one’s most intimate physical, emotional and intellectual self to the other” (Chundelikkat, 2009, p. 60). This kind of sexual discretion is the polar opposite of the so called “sexual freedom,” practiced by those who engage in it purely for pleasure.

It may also be emphasized that the Bible sets an order of intimacy permissible between man and woman. The sexual union between man and woman in marriage paves the way for a far greater intimacy than the relationship between mother and child or father and offspring (Chundelikkat, 2009, p. 58). This is so despite the genetic composition of

---

110 “I appeal to you therefore, brothers and sisters, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship.” Romans 12:1, NRSV Bible.

111 “Let marriage be held in honour by all, and let the marriage bed be kept undefiled; for God will judge fornicators and adulterers.” Hebrew 13:4, NRSV Bible. Also cf. “For this is the will of God, your sanctification: that you abstain from fornication; that each one of you know how to control your own body in holiness and honor” 1 Thessalonians 4:3-4, NRSV Bible.
the body of the child drawing far more from the parents. This happens even though the parent-child relationship is more ‘natural’ than that forged by two genetic strangers in marriage. Chundelikkat (2009) opines, “It is noteworthy that the ‘one flesh’ imagery is never used to describe a child’s relationship to its father or mother” (p. 60). Also, Adam’s proclamation, “She is the flesh of my flesh and bone of my bones”, in qualifying Eve, points to the common humanity of man and woman. On the other hand, the stark distinction of the human body, in its male and female forms, shows that the two are definitely different. In other words, man and woman are ‘equal but different’ (Sreejaya, 2014, p. 4) and that fact is most clearly evident in the bodies of the two.

Christian Anthropology also maintains that the first human was created with the capacity to work. Adam was also commanded to subdue the earth. The two facts, the capacity for work and the command to dominate the earth clearly imply that the human was created with a body. The Apostle’s Creed in the Catholic Church holds the ‘resurrection of the body’ as one of the articles of faith. After death, each person will be given a new ‘glorified [human] body,’ with new properties, not limited by space and time. If the Gospels are anything to go by, such a body will be like Jesus Christ’s own resurrected body.

---

112 “There was no one to till the ground.” Genesis 2:5, NRSV Bible.
113 http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/credo.htm
Interestingly, the ancient Indian understanding of Ardhanarishwara,\textsuperscript{115} depicts part masculinity and part feminineness in the same person. This idea seems to be echoed by modern medical science—the proportion of sex hormones, like testosterone and estrogen in the body, give it a predominantly female or male characteristic orientation. This would imply that both possibilities exist in the same person, especially the female person. That would be a support for the Ardhanarishwara philosophy. It is through the vehicle of the body that people express themselves and enact their masculinity and feminineness.

In William Blake’s ‘The Divine Image’\textsuperscript{116}, we have a personification of different elements of the body:

To Mercy, Pity, Peace, and Love  
All pray in their distress;  
And to these virtues of delight  
Return their thankfulness.  
...  
...  
For Mercy has a human heart,  
Pity a human face,  
And Love, the human form divine,  
And Peace, the human dress.

\textsuperscript{115} Ardhanarishvara (Sanskrit: अर्ध्नारीश्वर, Ardhanārīśvara), is a composite androgynous form of the Hindu god Shiva and his consort Parvati.  
\textsuperscript{116} William Blake, the Divine Image, from http://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems-and-poets/poems/detail/43656
The heart represents the motive for mercy, which goes beyond justice in the divine scheme of things. Justice is the satisfaction of a claim, violently sought; mercy is the benefaction of a gift, graciously given. The great difference between them is that whereas justice pursues self-interest, mercy seeks the welfare of the adversary (Mathulla, 2016b, pp. 17-18). The face represents an understanding and compassionate attitude. The whole human form stands for the embodiment of love. And the virtue of a person who comes in peace is personified by his / her attire. Blake thus found an anthropomorphic meaning in everything divine, and the human body is the site for manifesting the divine, and hence, the title of his poem, Divine Image.

An interesting comparison can be made to the Manusmriti\textsuperscript{117}, chapter I, verse 31: “But for the sake of the prosperity of the worlds, he caused the Brahmana, the Kshatriya, the Vaishya, and the Sudhra to proceed from his mouth, his arms, his thighs and his feet.” The human body is the source of different castes in the Indian social setup. From the head of Brahma, the deity, come the Brahmins, whose profession is interpreting the scriptures. From the arms, come the Kshatriyas, the warrior class; from the thighs, the Vaishyas, those who run business and commerce; and from the feet, come the Sudras, the scavengers of society.

It does appear in the Manusmrithi that there is a hierarchical order of importance accorded to the various parts of the body, which begins with associating the head to the Brahmins, whereas Blake’s schema has

\textsuperscript{117} Manusmriti – the Laws of Manu, translated by George Buhler. See http://hinduismfacts.org/ hindu-scriptures-and-holy-books/manusmriti/
no such hierarchy.\textsuperscript{118} It would seem that through the Sudras in Manusmrithi, a subordinate status was accorded to the feet. Here is yet another instance where the higher worth assigned to the head and the mind and a successively lower worth assigned to other parts of the body. This amounts to a distortion of the wholeness of the anthropos, where every part is equally important and each contributes to the overall working of the whole person.

According to ancient Indian philosophy, there is stula sharira and sukshma sharira. The former is the physical or gross body that is constituted by the Panchamahabhuta\textsuperscript{119} – it is vegetative in nature, requires food and suffers pain and decay and death. The latter is the ‘subtle body’ that ‘never dies’ and its immortality is akin to the soul. It is believed that ‘reincarnation’\textsuperscript{120} after death enables the soul to begin a new life in a new body; such a body could be that of any creature in the world, bird, animal, fish, worm or human. This depends on the kind of life led in the previous birth. There is a cycle of death and rebirth in this system; it is a central tenet of Hinduism.

However, it is hard to reconcile the immortal sukshma sharira with the reincarnation system. A philosophical difficulty with reincarnation into a new body is the lack of 1:1 correspondence between the number of sukshma shariras and the number of creatures who have incarnated.

\textsuperscript{118} William Blake, the Divine Image, from http://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems-and-poets/poems/detail/43656
\textsuperscript{119} Panchamahabhuta or the ‘five great elements,’ in Indian thought are vayu (air), jala (water), agni (fire), Akash (sky) and Prithvi (Earth).
\textsuperscript{120} http://www.britannica.com/topic/reincarnation
Starting from micro-organisms, the number of creatures on the earth far-outnumber the number of human beings there have ever been – just the bacteria in the human body would number more than a million living entities. If a human being is reincarnated as a creature, it can only be as one of them at a time. And if that is so, there simply is no accounting between the number of humans who have reincarnated and the number of creatures in the world. This represents a conundrum.

5.4 BODY IN SOCIETY

The human body is an entity to reckon with, not only for the life of the self but also for interpersonal relations that engage a person in society. This would imply that all our personal attributes attached to the body, like our gait, mannerisms, our proportion and symmetry, our balance and poise, our size and shape contribute to, and determine, in some part, our relations with the social world. They are part of body language, through which we communicate—they do not remain private, confined to the individual alone. Also, our senses, like the vision, the audition and the tactile nature of our bodies judge and assess others and the world outside. The body thus has not only a personal dimension, but a social one too\(^\text{121}\). Our corporal being is not just our own bodily dimension but also a part of everyone else.

There are norms that societies set and expect compliance with, when expression through the body is at issue. For instance, consider the

(online copy-written material, pagination not available)
namaskara" and the handshake. They are legitimate forms of greeting in different parts of the world. The way we conduct our bodily selves must be in keeping with expected social mores. The rules for such expression change with time and culture. For example, it is not a rare sight anymore to find people with headphones and wires hanging from the neck region downwards or a gizmo stuck into the ear while walking through public space, talking to nobody in particular. Such behavior must strike us as strange before the mobile communication revolution was ushered in. But today, it is in vogue. Given that the body commands attention in the social realm, we could say that the teacher must be dressed appropriately for the classroom. An elaborately showy dress by the teacher may be a distraction for the student. Students must be educated to use and display their body in society appropriately. There are important ways in which students can learn and teachers can teach and how schools can be organized through “culturally elaborated ways of attending to and with one’s body in surroundings that include the embodied presence of others”.

The attributes of a person, mentioned in the previous page, contribute to his/her very identity, thus making each person’s body unique and particular. That should explain the raison d’être for biometric

\footnotesize
122 The namaskara is the typical Indian greeting with folded hands, which is a gesture of welcome.

123 Thomas Csordas makes a cultural-anthropological argument about the use of the human body in society. See http://www.culanth.org/articles/301-somatic-modes-of-attention

124 The gait, the poise, the strides and the mannerisms etc.
identity equipment. It is true that the facial outlook can be altered but the basic identity cannot be tampered with. An example would be the structure and geometry of the eyeballs, which cannot be altered. On the other hand, the genetic makeup of a person can be altered through drug abuse.

5.5 BODY LANGUAGE

The body is also an instrument to express moods, desires, intentions and inclinations. By averting the eyes, we can show reverence or disinterest; by rolling the eyeballs, anger or dissent; and by screwing up the lips, we can signal the intent to non-cooperation. The whole gamut of facial expressions along with the display of fingers and the arms may be used to communicate. Words are not always necessary to get the point across. The use of non-verbal cues can be misused by those in power using subtle methods to get their way, without worry of a possible cognizable offence – the non-verbal cues used could be purported to portray meanings different from those understood. For example, a student who is out of favor with a teacher can be brow-beaten simply through facial expression! The student can be brought around thereby to an ingratiating disposition. The use of bodily expressions is conditioned socio-culturally and can convey both friendly and hostile meanings. If students learn, recognize and use body language, they will be adding to their repertoire of communicative abilities. By taking more data-entities than just speech into consideration, they can calibrate various important factors and make a more informed response. A more serious approach

that takes the social dimension of the body into account should be practiced instead of approaching body language lackadaisically. Body-language is not inconsequential. The student should be able to ‘read’ body-language.

5.6 PSYCHOSOMATIC NATURE OF THE ANTHROPOS

Similarly, any physical exercise, like a 20-minute run or a half-hour workout at the gym can release proteins called ‘endorphins’ in the brain. Endorphins ("endogenous morphine") are endogenous opioid peptides that function as neurotransmitters. They are produced by the pituitary gland and the hypothalamus in vertebrates during exercise, excitement, pain, spicy food consumption, love, and sexual activity, and they resemble the opiates in their abilities to produce analgesia and a feeling of well-being (Lam, 2016, pp. 33 & 172). The effect of these secretions is like injecting the drug, morphine into the body. The exerciser is left with a pleasant and relaxed feeling that lasts several hours. This psychosomatic phenomenon, which exhibits a seamless, interdependent relationship between mind and body, is a compelling argument for our thesis statement. Considering this closely, we find that exercise of the body causes the brain to release its ‘juices’, and conversely, these juices produce a calming sensation in the body. There is an important implication to this phenomenon: when the mind and body are relaxed, there is the ‘ambience’ for better concentration and focus. That is why it may be beneficial to have some physical workout before school begins in the morning each day. Students need to know and discover for themselves this happy tendency in the mind and body, and take advantage of it.
It may also be added that the well-being of the mind depends on that of the body. The adages, ‘sound body, sound mind’ or ‘sound mind in a sound body’ are popular in our lexicon. Looking at them from a more scholarly point of view, we have Plato in the Chapter XIII of *The Republic* saying, “[A] good soul by its virtue renders the body the best that is possible” (Ulich, 1999, p. 37). And Rousseau implies the reverse—that the sound body with efficiently working sense organs and the limbs lead to correct wisdom (see block quote in Section 4.6, Kant versus Rousseau). Rousseau’s thesis is also a basic premise of Yoga. The psychiatric health of the person requires the body to be exercised.126 Also, the diet of the person has a great bearing on the mind and body of the person. Indigestion, anorexia, obesity and eating disorders not only cause discomfort to the body but negatively dispose the mind and make its working inefficient. Loss of memory, inattentiveness and weak comprehension may be some of the fallouts. Students should learn the importance of keeping the right diet and developing and observing an exercise regimen. The time spent in exercising every day will only help the student to study better.

Many illnesses of little school-going children,127 such as breathlessness, shivers, giddiness, stomach ache etc. can sometimes be

---

127 Hurrelmann et al report from their study, “The results are based on a questionnaire survey carried out with a representative sample of 1717 students aged 13-16 in West Germany. The data support the hypotheses: psychosomatic symptom frequency is reinforced when adolescents experience failure in school and social and emotional conflict in their relationships with parents.” See
traced back to stressors in school or family. These psychosomatic ailments occur because the tender minds of children are vulnerable. They do not have an effective defense against overpowering or embarrassing acts meted out by others – it could be a teacher, who some children are mortally scared of, or a peer, who is a source of harassment. Schools must discuss such issues openly among children so that they are psychologically reinforced.

5.7 **FULL-EMPLOYMENT OF THE BODY IN LEARNING**

The five senses of the body play a vital role in the process of knowing when they are simultaneously brought to bear upon the question at issue. The *anthropos* perceives the world and carries sense information through the ‘intellection process.’ According to Scholastic philosophy, the ‘intellection process’ is carried out by data perceived by the five senses, which reach the mind through an intricate mechanism of the active and passive intellect, sense phantasm image formation, internal word generation and a feedback process (Francis, 2005, p. 11). In a science experiment to understand the physical phenomenon of ‘heat conduction,’ we can use a copper wire and a lit candle. While holding the wire at one end with one hand and holding the candle at the other tip with the other hand, conveying heat locally to the copper wire, we find that within a few minutes the other end of the wire will start feeling warm. The tactile nature of the body is employed, the visual nature of the body sees the candle flame and the olfactory sense smells the wax of the candle. The

phenomenon of conduction through the molecules can be imagined in the mind and verified by the multi-sensorial perception. Through imagination, we have the concept of heat conduction through a copper wire conceived in the mind of the student. The result of this multi-sensorial application is that there is both ‘perception’ and ‘conception’ (See Bittle quoted in Sections 4.11 and 5.1) in the learning process. Here is a more vivid learning experience for the student. This is the basis for the principle of ‘experiential learning’. The other alternative is simply to teach through chalk, talk and imagination.

5.8 BODY IN CHINESE THINKING

The body, in Chinese thinking, is not ontologically separate from the mind. In contrast to the western notion of ‘bodig,’ or vessel or container for the soul, the Chinese speak of the angry liver, the anxious heart, the melancholic spleen. Chinese people are trained to ‘listen within their bodies’ (Ots, 1990, pp. 21-28), which indicates how finely related the two (mind and body) are. There is no equivalent to the word ‘psyche’ in the Chinese language (Ots, 1994). The different functions are attributed to the different modes of existence of the body itself—they are the xin or the heart, which is the seat of cognition and rationality. Also, Chinese thought does not assign a subordinate position for the body in relation to the mind, as ancient Indian (khandogya upanishad) (Muller, 1879, p. 125) or Greek (Netleship, 1935, pp. 9-16) thinking do.

128 From the old Saxon, ‘Bodig,’ means vessel or container.
5.9 BODY IN LIFE AND DEATH

We find some insights in the distinction between the terms ‘personhood’ and ‘individuality,’ in Martin Buber’s ontology of the human person. The former is bound up with relationships between people. Buber’s I-Thou way of relating helps become a person. Yehuda Baruch (1998, pp. 135-143) says: “You become a person (as opposed to an alienated and isolated individual) when you enter into relation with people.” The ‘I-It’ way of relating, on the contrary, objectifies the other. Personhood has a very high order of dignity. It is vested with the ability to choose and reject, befriend or spurn, whereas ‘individuality’, is a depiction of a person who is a wholly solipsistic entity, strictly self-contained and not interested to commune or share with the other. Personhood is a very positive idea, whereas individuality would indicate self-centeredness. Personhood also involves immortality. Individuality lasts only the mortal span. All of a person’s achievements and his or her relationships to those living may constitute personhood. To put it another way, what we remember about influential people even after their death is their personhood. Thinking on these lines, it would seem that ‘personhood’ may or may not need a body, but individuality will necessarily require one.

A radically new point of view on the body is put forth by the Dutch anthropologist, Anne Marie Mol (2002, pp. 1-55)—she presents the body as multiple, more than ‘single’ but less than ‘many’ in the context of medical practice. She calls it the ‘body multiple’. This is so because the body is not just something that is bounded by the skin, but is part of and connected to various other bodies and techniques and technologies
(Blackman, 2008, p. 1). All these help the body to enact what it is to be human.

5.10 CLOSING REMARKS

We have, in this chapter, seen that the human body has a definite ontological legitimacy, and that it cannot be taken as subordinate to the mind. Such a tendency was prevalent since the ancient Greek and Indian traditions. It was philosophically revisited and reinforced, chiefly by Descartes and Kant in the modern era. However, we also find a few counter voices, like Rousseau, Nietzsche, Merleau Ponty, who have argued that the body is as important and essential as the mind, and that there is need to cultivate it. This poses a directive to the educational world, where this problem and its ill-effects are particularly evident. Education has inherited this flawed paradigm because of historical reasons. It is time to change and consider the student as ‘whole and entire’ rather than just as a ‘bright young mind.’ We need to appreciate and understand the indistinguishable and inseparable interconnection between mind and body. It would do a world of good for education if students are taught about phenomena, like multi-sensorial learning, psychosomatic nature of the human being, the principle of equality and the difference and complementariness of the male and female bodies, the concept of the social dimension of the body, the body in work and marriage, and the inclusion of body language in the repertoire of communicative abilities.

It was for very valid reasons that Plato emphasized the essence of the adage, “A sound mind in a sound body.” Among such subjects as
geometry for making war, astronomy for agriculture and navigation, and mathematics for business, Plato, in *The Republic*, included gymnasium and underscored the importance of a fit and healthy body. “Games and physical training are not merely necessary to health and development of the body but are required to balance and correct intellectual pursuits” (Livingstone, 1944, p. 10). Reflecting Platonic thought, Livingstone says: “The right education must tune the two strings of body and mind to a perfect spiritual harmony” (Livingstone, 1944, p. 10). Plato saw a modulating aspect in the development of the *anthropos* through training in music and the gymnasium. This was done to strike the golden mean between an extremely effeminate personality and an out and out beastly one. In Plato’s scheme, the body was to be brought under the control of the rational soul, just like the emotional component would be subservient to the philosophic mind. Bodily exercise was advocated “not so much at producing mere strength, as at awakening the spirited element in human nature” (Nettleship, 1935, p. 88). Plato expressly prescribes that between the ages of 17yrs to 20yrs, a certain period of physical exercises alone should be pursued to the exclusion of all serious mental work (Nettleship, 1935, p. 88). Marshaling all capacities of the body in the gymnasium would not just build muscle, but bring agility, concentration and goal-oriented-ness with the attitude of leaving no stone unturned, all of which are desirable qualities for a student. This way, Plato envisioned an ideal education that would enable every student attain the stature of a fully developed *anthropos*.