CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

In this concluding chapter we will discuss the points that have emerged from the work already done in the previous chapters. With the revolution of the analytical philosophy different sub-branches of philosophy have arisen. Philosophy of education is such a sub-branch of axiology developed in the 20th century. As a subject matter of philosophical thinking, education has always occupied its rightful position. But only analytical philosophers have given it a position as an independent branch of axiology. In India, philosophers are still not giving much interest to the work about the subject as an independent branch of axiology. In Indian philosophy, the study of education is a prime concern right from the Vedic age onwards. It has religious, social, racial and caste concerns as well as individual importance over the years. There are unlimited answers to the educational questions. But before studying the answers we should have the proper questions. Therefore, philosophy of education discusses the philosophical problems in the content of education. It helps in the systematic study of the educational problems.
Hence, philosophy of education is a continuous process of philosophical development in the field of education. It is the critical study of the general theory of education. Philosophy of education is also changing with the philosophy of life. It is a dynamic process. Value of life is different in different times and for different societies. Philosophy of education follows the changing values of that particular time and place.

We may discuss philosophy of education as a branch of either philosophy or education. The subject includes philosophical as well as educational problems. The philosophy of life, society, human values, perspectives, the aim of any philosophical findings, either epistemology or metaphysics or ethics, none is free from the educational content. Therefore philosophy of education discusses all the basic problems of general philosophy and every aspect of the educational process.

From different view points, philosophy of education is a subject matter of different branches. Philosophy of education takes into account educational values, norms and analytical aspects. So it is a branch of philosophy which discusses the aims, methods and curriculum, and gives the answers for the educators.
This research work is concerned with the Philosophy of Education with special reference to Bertrand Russell and Sri Aurobindo. It is expected that the findings of our investigations in this study would be substantial enough to give certain hints applicable for the philosophers of education and their further study. We seek to establish that Russell’s and Sri Aurobindo’s views are still relevant to the present situation of the world because of their practical impact on the people. Though Russell is a realistic philosopher of education and Sri Aurobindo is an idealistic (spiritual) philosopher of education, they have various similarities and dissimilarities in their views on philosophy of education. Through this research efforts have been made to throw light on Russell’s and Sri Aurobindo’s views on education in order that they may be judged either acceptable or not according to the choices of the people. The chapters of the work has been divided based on the nature, aim, curriculum, method and other significant aspects touched by both the philosophers. Through the study the normative value is judged and critically observed in its relevance.

Bertrand Russell is a realistic philosopher whose educational concept is basically based on behavioural and psychological nature of the individual. His educational theories are based on experiences of his
own life and are therefore more practical in nature. His educational problem is basically relevant to society as well as individuals. He is concerned about the problems of the educational theories, controversial aims, methods and curriculum throughout the world. Therefore, experiencing his own life, he described all these problems of education and tried to come to a commonly acceptable and uncontradictory solution. On the other hand Sri Aurobindo is a spiritual philosopher of modern India. But still he encompasses all the problems of social, political, educational, cultural, literature in his philosophy. As the other Indian philosophers of education have not done any analytical study of philosophy of education, Sri Aurobindo is also not separate from them. He tried to introduce a new concept of education relevant to all ages and to all the people of the society irrespective of any race, religion or culture. From his concept of education emerged a new horizon to the Indian masses. His philosophical description of educational problems, analysis of the aim of life (which is also the aim of education), principles, and methods — all represents his philosophy of education.

This study is divided into seven chapters. The first chapter is the introductory chapter of the philosophy of education. First it is tried to
develop the general concept of philosophy of education with the help of the analytical concept and definition. It is also tried to discuss philosophy of education as an independent branch of axiology. Philosophy of education discusses the philosophical problems common in the field of education. It studies the nature of education, its values and aims, and critically observes each of its aspects. But in the 20th century there was a controversy regarding the necessity of philosophy of education. Many of the analytic philosophers accepted philosophy of education as an important field of enquiry of educational theory. It is the philosophising of the educational experience, the critical observation of every problem of education, developing the process of dynamic and contradictory aim of education. Therefore all these points have been touched in the first chapter. In this study special reference is given to the British realistic philosopher of education, Bertrand Russell and the Indian spiritual teacher, Sri Aurobindo. Therefore the first chapter also deals with the introduction of Russell's and Sri Aurobindo's philosophies of education.

The second chapter is the "Philosophy of Education: Western and Indian Perspective". This chapter leads to the philosophical division of the philosophy of education. In western countries the philosophy of
education is divided according to the different theories of reality. Therefore in this chapter the division is made depending on the different theories, such as, idealism, naturalism, pragmatism, realism, Marxism and existentialism. The aims, methods, curriculum and the critical analysis are all different for every theory. But in the Indian philosophy of education we cannot find this western division of theories. However, it does not mean that there is only one view of philosophy of education in India. Since the time of Vedic age the meaning, process and the methods have been changing. When the Cārvāka School of Philosophy carries the materialistic view of education, the Nyāya School accepts the realistic view. The idealistic philosophy of education is derived when the Indian philosopher of education aimed liberation through the attainment of Brähman. The modern philosophy of education, on the other hand is a synthesized view of all the above theories. The modern philosophers of education have tried to develop the Indian masses materially as well as spiritually. An all-round development is the combined aim of the recent philosophers of education.

The third chapter deals with Russell and Sri Aurobindo’s general philosophical viewpoint. In this chapter, Russell and Sri Aurobindo’s
life, education and works have been discussed briefly. Their philosophical division is also analyzed at different points. Epistemology, metaphysics and the ethical analysis have also been introduced.

The fourth chapter is the "Nature and Aim of Philosophy of Education". In this chapter we have dealt with the concept of education accepted by both the philosophers. While Russell advocated realistic view of education, Sri Aurobindo introduced the idealistic view. Since Sri Aurobindo tried to synthesise the best of western and Indian origin, he integrated the scientific and materialistic benefit of the educational aim and the spiritual attainment of the Indian origin. He also tried for a philosophy of education which can help to integral the different aspects of the individual. His education is to the individual with the nation and for the universal humanity.

The fifth chapter deals with the "Method, Curriculum and the Teacher", which are the important ingrain of the philosophy of education. Both the philosophers adopted the Montessori and the Kindergarten method for the first stages of education. Russell depends on psychology and behaviour of the child while adopting methods for him. On the other
hand, for the attainment of divine perfection, Sri Aurobindo has suggested yogic methods and principles. To attain divine perfection, ordinary methods generally adopted by the European countries are not workable, believes Sri Aurobindo. Both have divided the curriculum depending on the age group and the capabilities of the students. The teacher has been given a lot of importance both in Russell’s and Sri Aurobindo’s philosophies of education, because the teacher is the gardener, as Rousseau says.

“Moral, Religious and National Education” has been discussed in the next chapter. Both the philosophers are different in tradition. The thesis is an attempt to synthesize both the western and the Indian traditions. Russell has discussed the patriotic view and does not accept any national formula which is used by different states. Sri Aurobindo’s philosophy of education is national in the sense that there should be national feelings but it is not against other nations.

Philosophy of education can be accepted as the pivotal force to ensure the unlimited growth of the mind. It is a critical analysis of the deeper vision and meaning of life. Besides these philosophy of education is also a process that aims at two very important aspects: analysis and
synthesis. While analysis is concerned with the clarification of the diverse problems of education, synthesis has its parameters in supplying us with possible alternatives.\(^1\) Sri Aurobindo's philosophy of education is known as 'Integral Education'. Sri Aurobindo did not use the term 'integral education' anywhere when he developed his philosophical thought on education. But his philosophy of education is integrated in two special senses. The first is that Sri Aurobindo tried to develop individual being integrating the five aspects of individual—physical, vital, mental, psychic and spiritual. Again education integrated individual development encompassing the national development which again leads to the development of human beings. His interpretation of education is in an integral manner as a whole.

Russell's educational theory is normative and critical in nature. His concept of the nature of education and the aims, adopted by him, follows the principles of normative theory. It justifies the goals, norms and standards of education as the normative theory follows. Again critical theory scrutinizes rigorously the terms and propositions involved in educational thought and practice. A pragmatic philosopher of education, Russell is especially critical when he criticizes the practical aspect of education. He was not satisfied with the educational system
of that time as it was influenced either by religion, or by states, or based on propaganda. He has also criticized all the education system and the aim of the well-known countries, and tries to establish a creative and productive educational system. Sri Aurobindo also criticized both the Indian and western education system of that time. He believes that western educative theories are more realistic and keep away from the spiritualistic value of life, whereas Indian education is more spiritualistic and therefore presents a crisis of the materialistic aspects. But we cannot say that Sri Aurobindo's philosophy of education is based on critical theory. Rather, it is a normative theory. His integral education leads to the aim of knowledge and human perfection. He emphasized the integration of all the standard theories of the east and the west for his qualitative aim of education. His aim is to the impact of subjective over the objective, the psychological over the physical and the philosophical over the materialistic. Mother holds this view in her own words, "Your aim should be high and wide, generous and disinterested; this will make your life precious to yourself and to all."\(^2\)

Russell has put less emphasis on spiritual education. He is more concerned with the all-round development through character formation
and informative knowledge. Though he is a realistic philosopher of education, his concept of character formation touches the idealistic view of philosophy of education because the idealists emphasized on men-making in its highest capacity. Development of vitality, sensitiveness etc. also constitutes the idealistic nature of education. Contrary to this, Sri Aurobindo's educational concept is completely idealistic in nature. Again Sri Aurobindo maintained that rational education is true and living education which goes beyond reason for the spiritual growth of man or human being. But in doing so he has not ignored the realistic and pragmatic aspect of education. His educational philosophy consists of all the good characteristics of the west and the east.

Russell advocated the democratic system of education as the ideal system at all levels of schools. About democracy, Russell said, "Democracy is good when it inspires self respect, and bad when it inspires persecution of exceptional individuals by the herd". Locke and Rousseau, the great reformers of education also led to liberalism and democracy, but consider only the education of an aristocratic boy for whose one man's whole time is devoted. But Russell emphasized the theoretical problem when he says that "the educational system we
must aim at producing in the future is one which gives to every boy and
girl an opportunity for the best that exists"^4 Here Russell meant that
average students should be provided the same education but some are
more talented than others. And if there is possibility to use them to the
community they need different treatment from that which is best for
average children. Here Russell is also democratic but different from
Locke and Rousseau in the sense that his theory is universal and also
gives the opportunity for the best people. He writes, "We can not
regard a method of education as satisfactory if it is one which could not
possibly be universal"^5 Russell appreciated Madam Montessori’s work
begun with nursery school in slums due to the best elements in her
educational theory and practice and which is extremely democratic in
nature.

Russell is in favour of giving the children education about sex.
According to him, policy of silence about the facts of sex has many bad
effects on children. For him one of the fundamental principles of any
sound ethic should be that all knowledge is good and to this no
exception can be admitted. The child, who notices that his natural
curiosity in a certain direction is met with frowns and rebuffs, learns to
assume that knowledge is good when it is uninteresting, but bad when
it is interesting. In this way scientific curiosity becomes opposed to virtue, and the child's efforts to be good become efforts to be stupid.

Another bad effect of this is that it causes children to think that their parents lie to them. On the part of teachers it is important that information on sexual subjects should be given in the same tune of voice and in the same manner as information about other subjects, and with the same directness.

Before puberty there is no difficulty which may cause a child to remain natural about sex, and to take it exactly the same way as he views other subjects. Russell says that 'this is the ideal to be aimed at through life.' Before puberty the question of sex in education can be treated on lines of mental hygiene without the necessity of forming very definite judgments on sexual ethics.

Russell mentioned about three divergent theories of education in his time. First is that the sole purpose of education is to provide opportunities of growth and to remove hampering influences. The second holds that the purpose of education is to give culture to the individual and to develop his capacities to the utmost. The third holds
that education is to be considered rather in relation to the community than in relation to the individual, and that its business is to train useful citizens. Russell thinks that none of the three is adequate by itself, and that the choice of a right system of education depends in great measure upon the adoption of a due proportion between the three theories. The first theory is the newest theory of Russell's time, while the third is the oldest one. The first theory is negative theory for Russell because it dominates much progressive thinking on education. This theory is more or less connected with the compulsory education, liberalism and freedom. Rousseau started the liberal thought. Belief in freedom in education exists in great measure among socialists, and even communists. Though there is more truth in the first theory but not with whole perfection; because for Russell, education has two purposes—"On the one hand to form the mind, on the other hand to train the citizen."

Russell makes difference between individual and citizen as follows, "The will of the individual considers in isolation is the will which says 'let such things be'. The attitude of the citizen is a very different one. He is aware that his will is not the only one in the world, and he is concerned, in one way or another, about bringing harmony out of the
conflicting wills that exist within his community. The individual as such is self-subsisted, while the citizen is essentially circumscribed by his neighbours."\textsuperscript{9}

Supra-mental evolution can be achieved only through the integral and to more extent through the Supra-mental education. Supra-mental education is another term for spiritual education. Supra-mental education is the last stage of the integral education. Supra-mental evolution therefore, can be achieved through and only after the evolution of the physical, the vital, mental and psychic evolution. The idea of Supra-mental education as well as the psychic education is Sri Aurobindo's significant contribution to the field of his philosophy of education. A.V Saraswati supported Sri Aurobindo in his book "Integral Education Thoughts and Practices". He states that integral ideal regarding education is taking place only in theory but in practice no one follows it. Education nowadays is job-oriented, examination-centred and pursuing individual requirements. It is the time that educationists should rethink and practice integral education in its real sense. "Man is essentially a soul and a spirit and not an animal. If man is to fulfil his own self a rethinking is necessary about education."\textsuperscript{10}
Russell's democratic education is for the masses, not only for the aristocrats, unlike Locke and Rousseau. Explaining his democratic new educational system, M.N. Roy pointed out that as a pre-condition of democracy, education is not just primary, traditional, higher or scientific education. It is the entire process of raising the intellectual and cultural level of the masses. Therefore so long as the moral and cultural level of the people does not rise, the aim of education is not realized. The aim of education is not merely to provide the three R’s but to create among the people a consciousness towards humanity. It is a consciousness of the right to be human beings and of its excellence and dignity. The purpose of education is to help them in utilizing their reason in this thinking. Only this type of education leads to a real democracy not only in a nation but in the whole world. Sri Aurobindo also mentioned the same in his integral education saying that it is the integrity of the individual, nation and the universal human being. Dr. Rādhākrishnan opines that “the purpose of all education, as admitted by the thinkers of East and West, is to provide a coherent picture of the universe and integrated way of life.”11

Sri Aurobindo is against informative knowledge, but Russell considers it as a part of education. According to Russell, education is generally in
two senses — the broader and the narrower. In the broader sense its aim is character formation, and in the narrower sense, education may be confined to instruction, the imparting of definite information on various subjects, because such information, in and for itself, is useful in daily life. But for Sri Aurobindo, education is not the amount of information that is put into your brain and runs riot there, undigested on your life. We must have a life-building, man-making, character-making assimilation of ideas. If you have assimilated five ideas and made them your life and character, you have more education than any man who has got by heart a whole library. Vivekananda also believes that if education and information were identical, libraries would be the greatest sages in the world and the encyclopaedias the Rishis. Pestalozzi, on this same issue, claims that the right action of the child is necessary in the process of education. Again, right action lies in right thinking, right feeling and right living.

Sri Aurobindo’s philosophy of education is nothing but his Integral Education. Integral education is true education. While traditional education confines itself to passing an examination and obtaining a degree or a certificate, integral education extends itself to the development of all the aspects of the human personality—physical,
vital, mental, psychic and spiritual, in short, an integrated personality. Integral education breaks down the dichotomy between matter and spirit, it aims at achieving the authority of the spirit over a matter fully developed and utilized. It includes the arts and the sciences, the ethical and the aesthetic, the curricular and the co-curricular. It aims at the manifestation of the perfection already in man and the development of consciousness from the material to the spiritual, from the inconscient to the super-conscient. Transformation, as the means of establishing a divine life individually and socially, is the ultimate goal. When Sri Aurobindo spoke about true education, he also tried to correspond it with the view of integral education and national education. For him, true education is nothing but the emancipation of the individual being as well as the nation. Individual development is again dependent on the different aspects of life such as physical, vital, mental, psychic and spiritual. These phases of education succeed each other in a chronological order following the growth of the individual. This, however, does not mean that one should replace the other but that all must continue, completing each other, till the end of life.

Both these philosophers aimed for the perfection of the human life. Russell imagines the individual to be like Leibniz’s monads — he should
mirror the world. But it should be mirrored with emotion, along with knowing and power. "Knowledge, emotion, and power, all these should be widened to the utmost in seeking the perfection of the human being."\textsuperscript{13} Sri Aurobindo's human perfection consists of perfection of body, life and the divine. He advocates the education of perfection. The education system in general is to realize the human perfection. But, for Sri Aurobindo human perfection itself is imperfect if the mind is imperfect; the mind, which helps to realize the Divine Body, the Divine Life and the Divine perfection. Rādhanākrishnan also accepted the same perfection in his own words, "Man's quest for perfection consists in organizing the things of body, mind and soul into a whole."\textsuperscript{14} Gandhi also added, "By education I mean an all round drawing out of the best in child and man, body, mind and spirit."\textsuperscript{15} For Jawaharlal Nehru "Right education must be on all round development of the human being, a harmonizing of our internal conflicts and capacity to co-operate with others."\textsuperscript{16} The purpose of life and the purpose of education are the same, according to Sri Aurobindo. Integral education is the education of perfection. Vivekananda says, "By education I mean the manifestation of perfection already in man."\textsuperscript{17} Gandhiji integrated educational ideals when he said that education meant to bring out the best in the child, a man his body, mind and spirit. Rabindra Nath
Tagore also meant the same when he said education is to help us realize the inner principle of unity of all knowledge and all the activities of our social and spiritual being. Krishnamurti, in a similar vein, says that the function of education is to bring about an integrated individual who is capable of dealing with life as a whole. According to Nehru the aim of education should be to produce people with integrated personalities. Rādhākrishnan felt the same and therefore wrote, “Deep in our hearts there is reverence for life and it is this aspect which we should stress in the education of children.”18 But Russell’s concept of perfection is not similar to Sri Aurobindo’s one. The perfection of the individual for Russell is based on the social, moral and pragmatic value. But Sri Aurobindo stresses the spiritual perfection which is beyond the individual and social touch.

To attain the Brāhman is the ultimate perfection, the self-realization. The ultimate aim of Gandhi’s philosophy of education is also to attain the ultimate aim of life- the aim of self-realization, the knowledge of Truth and God in one’s life. M.N. Roy is against any compulsion in education, because compulsion is against liberty. Education should help man and women to think rationally and to decide for themselves, about the problems to be solved. The aim of education is not merely to
provide the three R's but to create among the people a consciousness towards humanity. It is the consciousness towards its rights to be human beings and consciousness of its excellence and dignity. The purpose of education is to help them in utilizing their reason in this thinking. This type of education leads to a real democracy not only in a nation but in the whole world. Pestalozzi also maintained the same view when he said, “You should do for the children what their parents fail to do for them. The three R's are not, after all, what they most need. It is all good and well for them to learn something but the really important thing for them is to be something. Only when this truth is fully realized by teachers and school managers will there be some hope for national education.”

Dr. Radhakrishnan thinks that “the purpose of all education, as admitted by the thinkers of East and west, is to provide a coherent picture of the universe and integrated way of life.”

Sri Aurobindo's integral education is also similar to the Gitā. The Gitā gives status to the all round development of the individual to achieve the individual and social responsibility. The virtuous knowledge of Gitā is similar to the spiritual knowledge of Sri Aurobindo.

In his philosophy of education Russell synthesizes the education of character and education in knowledge. Regarding intellectual education
Russell thinks that there are certain qualities known as intellectual virtues which are essential for the successful pursuit of knowledge. And intellectual education helps to find out and develop these qualities. These qualities are curiosity, open-mindedness and the belief that knowledge is possible through difficult, patience, industry, concentration and exactness. Sri Aurobindo also emphasized that knowledge is of two kinds, the knowledge of things and the knowledge of men. Knowledge of men means human thought, human actions, human nature and human creations while knowledge of things implies all types of knowledge not directly connected to man. Therefore both of them tried to develop the knowledge of the individual through the intellectual education. Russell suggests a comprehensive philosophy of education which may lead to the emergence of a happy man in a happy society. Sri Aurobindo also signified the same meaning when he spoke of the integral development of individual, nation and universal human being.
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