

The Central Curriculum of Education: the praxis of *be(com)ing* human

**Bas key dushwar hei har kaam ka asaan hona
Aadmi ko bhi moyasir nahin insaan hona**
(Asad ullah Khan Ghalib¹)

*As difficult it is for everything to be easy,
So man strives to be fully born as a human being.*
(literal translation- Sohaila Javed)

*If only, like dialectic
s/he lets a naked nerve on parole:
a kind spectacle
of wet air augurs
self to witness its own guest: itself
for becoming that it is not- human.*
(Interpretation - Sohaila Javed)

“In a fear- inspiring way I am wonderfully made.”
(Psalm 139: 14)

And not done, till I wonderfully become.
(Sohaila Javed)

ABSTRACT

This piece (written in response to reading about our environmental crises, especially concerns raised by Erazim Kohak, 1999) is an invitation to readers for an intentional and reflective pause, as reflecting subjects, to step inside self so as to experience the marvels of progression from mere human being unto becoming human. Its essence is reciprocity between these two evolving moments of self, the first prior awakening to essential self, and then, functioning that potentiality into actuality for it determines “the entity to be and to become what it potentially is...” (Shalom, 1984). This paper amounts to looking at the form-matter unity from inside the unity, and then, working out of our status quo, becoming our own active outsider. Its investigatory purpose arises as a coming-in response to our contemporary awakening to spirituality, and the pedagogical implications of such a response. This reflective piece has words and poetry in italics that is my creation, Reference (words carrying superscript), Glossary (words in bold), and Bibliography sections.

Here perhaps begins a deep undertaking of life--discovering a dimension of depth-- religious, mystical and ethical, or in just one word, spiritual, which life may hold for humans. To seek is to delve into **Self**, self and life for real seeing, **Self-realization** and **self-realization**--the undeniable interconnections that en(twin)e humans as biotic particles in the stream of life. Understanding life as a good and meaningful gift, coming from Source of Life to living beings, intensely evokes wonder and in/forms reality. Also, a humane approach to its meaning and value invites presence and participation, recognition and acceptance, offering immense possibilities to creatively become all that we are capable of becoming. Perhaps, herein lies the desire for creative response and personal responsibility. It is an assignment of lifetime and the meaning of our being and the value of our becoming, celebrating sacred bio-centrism in its own small way. So here I am, thinking through the fundamental issue of human 'being' upon this sacred earth and its related proximal development, and the inalienable possibility of what becoming human means. It is not without good reason for companions of this now not-so-beautiful earth, whose unbecoming exactly parallels our just being human. If only we would understand-----

That is the intended magic and wise thought consuming serious thinkers the world over, and making ways to our centrist ethos for knowing how to survive as intelligent, sane, sensitive beings of the best kind, namely, the human kind, inhabitants of the same good Earth until the end of time.

The purpose of this paper is to share with readers a philosophical reflective research concerning human presence on the earth at a time when humankind can no more str/etch a little to be more. It is a matter of attitude, heart perception, conceptualizing intention, will, and desire to remain human in passivity or become human in accordance with our ideological or imaginative perception of what might be or ought to be, and the status of human being thereafter--that is a philosophical human question. It involves a human quest of searching ways, of knowing that are not alienable to humans. Calling and coming to seek them is the most appropriate and authentic response. We can, if desirable, construct a model of sustainable lifestyle and then, live that style. Our task and true commitment would be to work on that style in artful reconstruction as an aesthetic ethics praxis, so important from the perspective of our human individuality and humanity. It is, verily I think, our task and the meaning of our being. For our continuity and sustainability, we need to seek out a sustainable mode of peaceful coexistence and then, what we necessarily

need is the spiritual courage and determination to live that way of being. Is that being educative? Spiritual? Sacred?

If only we desire----- yes, desire is the great imperative, an abstraction, yet a uniqueness that arises in the heart, and consumes us wholly for a better possibility through education. As long as we consider ourselves always within the limits of growth, and consider expansion and enhancement impossible, not even the best ways can help us. However, with the desire to excel, constraints such as that of time, mortality and our vulnerability to painful experiences serve as moderation, willing us *meezan* (balance) to keep us in the straight way that generates right action, and is noble and beautiful for the joy and serenity it brings. A passionate desire, here, simply makes a way for going even beyond the limits, and putting essential being and knowledge into action. It is therefore not simply a 'living' question but one that conceives of human living in the ecological context, and makes the simple *teacher-learner* interaction in a compassionate ethos appear as eco-pedagogical philosophy of an ethical world that is the ethology of teaching. The point is to sign a simple accord with nature and reinterpret human nature in accordance with it, and then, bring human law to confirm the accord as Kant would say. This is a possibility—dismissing it altogether seems pointless. And rightly so, C. S. Peirce asks us not pretend to doubt in philosophy what we do not doubt in our hearts. That would be a prime silent teaching for an educator in any discipline, and a singular note to know this educator as a teacher for this is essentially what education is about.

This understanding in/forms participatory existence and gets informed through the symbiotic way of deconstruction and reConstruction for human understanding. This is a personal testament of faith and passionate concern. The emphasis here shifts from relations to relationship, from self to 'you and me' as 'us' in our embodied **amness** that is compassionate and conscious. As Richard Falk implied, a passionate relationship is richly relational, and which has the reality of internal relations abides, and is unabiding, infinite, and eternal. This is where the human story begins—the sacred Source, home that is not wholly transcendent but always within heart, where the entire creation gathers to meet, experience and feel related. Out of this core, grows heart's content, embodied as reflected expressions of creative communication and compassionate practice of a living curriculum. The eco-pedagogical con(texts) undertake "the

humanness of human beings” (Madison, 1988, p. 154) as a response to the metaphysical questions, “What is ‘man’?” and “What is man’s place in nature?” And then, we see ourselves embedded in the numinous dynamics (Swimme, 1999) of a compassionate ethology, the ethics of living in Education¹ and a willful desire that every human *be*

pure
transparent
humanness.

Of hum/animal relations

Leading preponderant lives for many incredible centuries makes us speak of ‘humans and animals’ as distinctive beings in the pedigree of creation (Kohak, 1999). Obligated by self-glorification, and the element of non-humanness that we associate with animals, we assumed that animals are random objects, lower in demeanour, felled as they are on four legs. So alien in comportment, these poor, bare creatures seem God’s cynical tryst or diabolical miscue on the world stage. Casting them away as aliens, we had our own world and life as animate beings, processed by our social order and possession of human potentialities that we could never associate ourselves with animals, as partners of one life-world. Disconnection from the animal kingdom has diminished us tremendously. We are less, not more, by this missing connection. Whatever we speak ill of, diminishes us, since all forms of living beings without exclusion are connected to us, and are integral to our being. The *egotistical sublime* (John Keats, 1818) in us grows and gives us an attitude of anti-biocentrism--an attitude based on disrespect of all life, and the pledge to destroy life rather than care for it, far from celebrating it.

This is the underpinning thought of human consciousness, arising as it did from taking a literal understanding of the conception of a hierarchical ordering of ‘higher’ and ‘lower’ beings, and consequently its meaning and value to humans, being the centrist ethos of God’s creation. Their pertinacious coming from above in the sequence of God-angels-humans, while all other life rises from below, in the sequence of matter-plants-animals insists on the idea of total separation. It still impinges upon our consciousness and modes of existence, and defines human-animal and human-human relations in a way that makes the concept of humans as the crown of creation, endowed with an immortal soul, active intellect at the time of birth as problematic.

The meaning of this sequence should not be ‘higher’ or ‘lower’ in the conventional sense. Rather, it should be about human responsibility to use this intellect, and human capacity to care and be responsible. Of course, in their sense of freedom, I think, they can do practically anything they wish. When indeed, we need to rethink the notion of freedom for it shouldn’t be defined as freedom to do anything, for then, it creates those conditions that prevent us from fulfilling the human potential to be really enlightened. Our less humanistic worldview today robs us of true **EnLightenment**. Instead of liberating us from pretence, prejudice and differentiation, we are caught up by the sole significance of humans and their dominating wishes. What else is, insignificant?

The value of enlightenment and its significant use lies only in serving or resisting human wishes. However, the thought it engenders is for the enlightened to have value, insisting upon humans the position of the master, and the will for possession and power or to slavishly live the will of the master. It also presupposes our status as ‘higher’ beings, free of all consideration toward lower beings as the other. Our self-regarding instinct, in order to accommodate the ‘survival instinct’ by recognizing our ‘inherent’ right to self-defense and self-glorification, called psychological egoism, has practically driven us into master-slave relationship with all those we consider as the Other. Kohak (1999) fears that these lesser order beings, so labeled for their ordinary peripheral existence, and less privileged status, are excluded from visibility, understanding and responsibility towards them, based as it is upon the ideas of human superiority and human distinctiveness.

This is where I encounter points of difference with the dominating thought of (un)enlightened beings. The moment is insistent and calls for an intentional and reflective pause. It reminds me of “classic thought², dominated by Aristotle that created vitalism by endowing living systems with a non-material purposeful driving component that attained expression through the realization of their forms.” Continuing this talk in the preface to *Autopoiesis and Cognition* (1980), Sir Stafford Beer confirms that

Thence, under the pressure of unavoidable experience and the definite thrust of Cartesian thought a different outlook emerged, and mechanism gradually gained the biological world by insisting that the only factors operating in the organization of living systems were physical factors, and that no non-material vital organizing force was necessary. (p. 74)

Maturana calls this “non-material” vitalism “spirit,” and finds it invested with Self-organizing unity. It brings me to the Aristotelian interpretation of humans as spirit-mates of God-Spirit with their active intellect while animals with their passive intellect are enjoined with mental activities, consciousness, emotions, understanding. All these external manifestations of the soul or psyche, Aristotle’s passive intellect or mere “animality” fleshed out in animals, the lesser beings walking on four legs. These poor, bare, unaccommodated creatures, devoid of value, dependent for it on humans and their wishes, treated as raw material, base material organism, flawed at birth, God’s brute, our non-human kin, mere animals. When, in truth we are the most dependent creatures! We want them, Kohak protests, even their furs and toil!

That makes it important for me to seek out the external manifestation of that human spirituality which evinced much amazement from Shakespeare’s Hamlet:

**What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason!
how infinite in faculties! in form and moving, how
like an angel! in apprehension, how like a god! The
beauty of the world! The paragon of animals!**

(Act II, Scene ii, 303-307)

This fine quintessence of ethereal composition wins godly designation as the “locus of permanence” (Shalom), the immortal spirit s/he shares with God-Spirit. Is this enough to guarantee humans their alleged exceptional status as human beings, the crown of creation (*ashraf ul makhluqatⁱⁱ*)? Or something *more* that becomes a strong impetus for me to come to a startling realization about humans as the hum/animal.

The Metaphysics of human (Inter)Subjectivity

“Mr. Palomar thinks that every translation requires another translation, and

so on...Yet he knows he could never suppress in himself the need to translate, to move from one language to another, from concrete figures to abstract words, to weave and reweave a network of

analogies. Not to interpret is impossible, as refraining from thinking is impossible.”

(Calvino, 1985)

And what about translating the Other

A reconnection is imperative in order to end the impossibility of interpreting the Other as “locus of permanence” (Shalom, 1984), an immaterial some-thing, that provides an epistemological springboard for attaining truths about Reality. Since I know that I am, I cannot doubt that I exist. This proves, as Saint Augustine argued “there are truths that I can attain to; it proves the existence not only of a substantial soul but also, ultimately, that of a metaphysical or onto-theological God which, as pure being, is also absolute, immutable substance” (*De Civitate Dei*, xi, p. 26).

The permanent locus of the embodied human being determines that it will become what it potentially is. This is that specific particular that explicates itself spatio-temporally in the existing physical temporality as “an actually existing timeless potentiality indefinitely actualizable as a result of actions which refer back to it, or which stem from it (Shalom, 1984). It requires a temporal-time frame to be understood conceptually, and observed experientially, but essentially is the “locus of permanence,” and therefore beyond the temporal mode of existence. This is the same specific particular that is essentially present in the human self as “a locus of permanence which then, explicates itself spatio-temporally as the development of ‘that specific particular,’ ” a part of the physical entity as a whole. This “unitary particular or individual” continues to actualize itself in the world, and manifests itself thus as necessity.

Albert Shalom³, a metaphysician of subjectivity, in speaking about this self-determining activity “the internalization within the locus of permanence of its own processes as identity,” tells us:

 this locus of permanence is not to be conceived as a
 separate entity, an entity apart from the physical entity as
 a whole, but as the permanent
 locus of that physical entity as a whole determining the entity
 to be and to become what it potentially is.... (p. 269)

Its principal functioning determines those reactions as potential responses to its actualizing potentiality. And what this potentially is, it becomes in

its actualization, further determining that this locus of permanence is “a center of power.” This centralized power is the dynamism that Aristotle conceived as the specific particular of animate organisms, and is Being’s distinctness with infinite creative intention and capacity for the perennial unfolding of this unitary “specific particular.”

Witnessing this principal functioning in creative performances is another experience of the center of power, determining to itself the entity to be and to become what potentially it is capable of. The externalization to this effect is experiencing the internalization within the locus of permanence of its own original identity. This is the permanent status of dynamic being, and needs to stay as an actualizing becoming entity as Albert Shalom tells us even more:

‘experiencing’ is a particular mode of the reflecting, or internalizing, of specific spatio-temporal energy transactions of particular identities or loci of permanence. That is to say, from this standpoint, ‘experiencing’ is a derivative reality from the more fundamental principles of the constant dialectic within living and sentient organisms and actualized by means of their particular identities or loci of permanence. (p. 270)

As essence experiences its immutable truth, the identity that is conceived at this significant time, determines and defines the specific sort of identity it is to itself. This means

the transformation of incessant and physical processes into a quasi-timeless analogue of the constant repetitions of these physical processes themselves.... In other words, the varied mass of bodily processes, as they are internalized in the locus of permanence or identity, constitute the emergence within that identity of a sense or a feel of that identity itself. (p. 271)

What arises is a new subjectivity--a new Self with the sense of organism’s identity reflected or internalized in the locus of permanence, through and by means of that specific process which defines that locus as a ‘self’ or identity of a specific kind. This permanent locus operates, and it is a *transforming* of particular kind, of the physical and spiritual processes

that constantly remind us of our immense potentiality, and pertinacious becoming power. Senseless sensation, being a physical process, is constantly succeeded by fresh reminders of consummate being in this active moment, and that affords some kind of vicarious understanding of ourselves, the semantically exact, homogeneous idealities (Shalom, 1984) that spiritual activity as potentiality affords them to be. This is another way of knowing about our true subjectivity and desirability of self-change.

Resistance to such phenomenological understanding is the breeding ground of senseless narcissistic we. Therefore, remaining open to our interested and living subjectivity actually opens up an alternative practice of discourse which emphasizes its act, character and situatedness (in Madison, 1988, p. 174), and becomes what the Japanese call *yu-mu*, a *pure site* for shifting configurations and immense possibilities. Since I cannot doubt that I exist on this site, more alive I am as a specific particular in subjective experiences that determine my particular identity as a subjective human, I endorse progressive positiveness that purity of heart, mind and soul feels, engenders and posits. This proves there are truths I can attain to; it proves the existence of a substantial soul or intellect that is in constant discourse with other soul entities that human (inter)subjectivity opens me to. This is pure subjectivity in review of metaphysics, as it gets formed in the presence of true Being and infinite becoming capacity. The inevitable question is what does this leave us with? Here we run into the ‘end of philosophy’ theme: the human meaningfulness of self as the beginning of human action.

What more of this animal

This “paragon of animals,” as Shakespeare has cited human, has more traits than mere chance would grant, such as ‘upright’ posture, clothing, a feelingly expressive face, speech, reason and freedom as essential signs of humanity. Human ability to speak becomes power when s/he captures the fleeting moments in concept, and gives them habitation in written form as word, an immediate capturing of moving thoughts and flying images, an important distinctive feature of that ennobling spirit so magnanimously given to human beings as birthday gift. And the soul, that both human and animal inherit, and for human consciousness to make it intellect, and worthy of intellectual pursuits!

Erazim Kohak (1999) thinks that the entire imposing construction of human civilization is based on this ability. Further traits as mere possession and their profitable use are more empowering and distinguishing notes for humans. Theirs is an exemplary power to define “ideal relations among components of experience.” Reason and understanding, and the possibility of comprehensive and creative imagination, makes them capable of not only building things in the air, and encountering them as local habitation and name (Shakespeare). It is the capacity of imagining them as *khayal* (image) in ideas and concepts, and then languaging them, and giving them many visual lives. Human capacity for both is not just a capacity. This image-making faculty, intensified through the intellect and appearing as a whole *mélange* of “non-actual possibilities,” becomes the basis of human freedom, and also of accepting critically what there is from the choices we see and apprehend in material and immaterial forms as could be or should be. Or else, as Hamlet apprehended:

**What is a man,
If his chief good and market of his time
Be but to sleep and feed? a beast, no more.
Sure he that made us with such large discourse,
Looking before and after, gave us not
That capability and godlike reason
To fust in us unus'd.**

(Act IV, Scene V)

These frightening possibilities thus assign us the moral/ethical responsibility of owning our choices and using them positively on the ever-expanding spiral journey we embark upon, delighting the Transcendent Other (Huebner) along the way, and simultaneously affirming our soul enlargement (Eckhart). And what would delight God more is remembering You in acts of prayer and meditation, and the ethics of living responsibly--sacred for the very deep, inalienable and irrevocable connection formed when He had “breathed part of My Spirit” (The Quran) to us at the time of our birth. And the integrity of our animate being is to manifest our “immortal spirit” that defines our birth-right, and our ethical responsibility to perform it sensibly and also joyfully. It has to be seen as a moral and spiritual response for only then it can generate the action. For in the educational domain, such an action needs to be generated--action that has positive value, is broad-based, includes all, and is instrumental to our spiritual growth and development

as human individuals with humanness. As doing subjects, we always need to go beyond what we know, and quite rightly put into effect what we know, otherwise to what effect is our being as knowing subjects, our **self-realization**, and our state of knowing too, I contend.

My seeing contention is that human bodies gain the dignity of human beings only when we embody our spirituality, make positive use of the given faculties, as outward manifestation of our God-Spirit. We need to make wise choices, rather than refuse the signs of humanity as undesirable faculties, defying humanity in the indefatigable way we have been doing egotistically for the purposes of self-regard or under the guise of self-defense against extremism. Otherwise, I think that we have never simply become human, and so have no right to this deference. We have remained human, merely being with the mere possession of innate wisdom and goodness, imagining ability, reason and speech and higher intelligence as soul, capability of recognizing moral responsibility, or are hum/animal, another species with mere “animality”--the soul or psyche, with Aristotle’s passive intellect. Only with the actualization of that equipment called active intellect, immortal spirit in the process of ethical living that human soulness, something eternally ethereal arises in our continuous be(com)ing that we become human and qualify for the grand status of humankind, the crown of creation (*ashraf ul makhluqat*). Or else what is the difference between human body and animal body, which Descartes imagined as simple machines, not kin to humans’ immortal souls.

What moves the mover

The simple essential substance of the **soul** is human endowment. It is a gift of another kind, and therefore, has eternal existence and is the cognition of life. Once within the capacity of the body, it becomes the centre of power, is self-moved, and has intellectual cognition of itself. Because it is self-generating and therefore, self-existent, it is an integral substance of the human phenomenon. It has no opposite, and therefore does not perish or vanish. Because its essential being is a feelingly substance, it knows that it essentially is the “locus of permanence” and the “center of power” (Shalom, 1984). And this centrality of power is the simple basis of every human’s autopoiesis and autopoietic living. Miskawayh⁴ (Muslim ethicist) in his *al-Fawz al-Asghar* wonders as to those who do not know their essential substance, their own centrality, and become causal to its unused full potentiality. Their darkened existence

and the much civilizational darkness they perpetuate in other's lives is that pervades human society today, I wonder. His *Mukhtasar Siwan al-hikma* expresses this wonder too:

He who does not know his soul while it resides in the body has no way of knowing it once it has departed from the body. Everything is concealed from one who does not ponder everything. He who knows not the source of evil cannot be saved from it.

(First Discourse, pp. 5-10)

To know the soul is to know self and self-power, and to what uses this permanent locus can be put to before its voluntary departure and our involuntary death. It is our success to contemplate the noble substance that is within us. If we do not, it counts to the "loss of sensibilia, and we are stricken with anxiety over death." Here too, I wonderfully find Miskawayh quoting from the philosophers:

Die voluntarily, for voluntary death is training in abandoning the sensibilia, and the corporeal pleasures, in discarding passions, and in comporting oneself according to the intellect and the intelligibilia.

(Sixth Discourse, p. 187)

He then concludes

If one devotes oneself with all, or most of one's powers to this purpose, not taking pleasure save in [the intellect and intelligibilia], not desiring particulars and sensibilia, being, as it were, separate from them, despite contact with them, he will then be unafraid of death and join those who are lustrous and triumphant, in the vicinity of God, where there is no fear or grief.

(Sixth Discourse, pp. 192-193)

This is wisdom and understanding derived from ancient revelations and the rest is self-revelatory.

The gift of fearlessness and resistance from fearful living is always within reach. If only we know.

So pondering in solitude and devotion, Goodman (1994) finds Miskawayh stressing upon removing

our senses from affectations and becoming receptive for that for which we have readied ourselves. And so we may solve different problems, recite poetry, recollect, understand, and so on. If we turn in this way to a star, readying ourselves, we receive the form and influence as the star receives what it is ready to receive from the Creator.

(pp. 1000-1021)

This is self-preparation for important task of **individuation**, and the performance of tasks well chosen by educators world round. The rest is ambrosia or otherwise.

And what is more here

The simple basic state, which the human subject adopts after being, and before any other identity gets constructed (with all metaphysical birthday essentials--intelligence, soul, nous, spirit-immaterial some-Thing as “intellect and intelligibilia”) is of nothingness. It is a unique perceptible characteristic of human existence and its abstraction continues in our unknowing it. We know we have a body, but unlike other bodies, a body with consciousness, with intellectual cognition and spiritual realization. This immediately entwines both body and mind in our self, and engages metaphysical attention to what happens therein. Madison (1988) extends his phenomenological gaze to the awareness of self in “Hermeneutics of (Inter)Subjectivity,” and says

Privileging, as they are wont to do, seeing (theorin), thinking, consciousness, metaphysicians seek to determine exactly *what it is that we are conscious of when we exist consciously*. Is it ideas in our own mind? Or is it movements in our body? And how can we be certain that we are conscious of what we think we are conscious of, not merely oneirically imagining the whole thing?

(p. 156)

He thinks of the human mind in the arena of consciousness where it lives in experiential domains that are linguistically expressed:

But is the human person, the self, the subject, am I, are you nothing but, nothing more than a bundle of conditioned reflexes, a flow of neural impulses, a self-programming computer, a haphazard colony of selfish genes?

(p. 157)

This is serious reflection on the consequential human condition of this intense neural activity that pervades human being today, and ironically brings the dehumanizing reduction of the self that it has inadvertently brought to itself. This was this human's preferential choice, and in a mood of arrogant preference and arresting the quality of choice, s/he calls it success. With this unconscious reductionistic behavior, the human observer still remains in the center of things. This is the physical reality and shall remain so till human is without being human, and rings perennially with Ghalib's poetic sensibility: *aadmi ko bhi muaser nahin insaan hona*.

My simple question then, arises: *what is that we are not conscious of when we exist self-consciously?* If we begin to think of this state as *nothingness*, and feel this no-thing as indeed it is, if substance is taken as the paradigm of being, before any formal identity gets constructed as a result of consciousness, and then, reflectively experience "consciousness as nothingness" (Madison), and let that state continually coexist with our be(com)ing, we may "make better sense of the fundamentally human question, which simply will not go away, of what it means to be a subject, a human person" (Madison, 1988, p. 158). Perhaps, this nothingness is after all not-so-nothing a state as we deem it self-consciously, and we may turn out to be some-thing more than our overt "nothing," some-thing more than "a bundle of conditioned reflexes." Speaking Ricoeur's language, if the "essence" of consciousness is not to be what it is and to be what it is not, does it downplay sense if the "essence" of consciousness remains nothingness as an experiential state throughout existence? If it already is that, as a result of intense neural activity, what else would it be? It becomes the elitist knowing to give it an experimental trial.

That is the quest of my inward knowing, and as I read Ricoeur, it is the "essence" of metaphysics in terms of Nietzsche's opposites: such as appearance-reality, sensible-intelligible, material-immaterial, becoming-being, fact-essence, practice-theory and of course, matter and spirit,

nothing and everything. Thinking metaphysically of human be(com)ing, so we live in the body, and select spiritual consciousness along with emotional awareness for our living practice of human action as the basis of human experience in the unity of such irreconcilables. In psychoanalyst Roy Schafer's (1978) words, the self becomes "an experiential phenomenon, a set of more or less stable and emotionally felt ways of telling oneself about one's being and one's continuity through change" (p. 15). So for many in the act of being no-thing nothing, 'I' finds itself and 'me' only through this act. Remembrance of this act is causal to transformation that furthers activity from oneself to your self and innumerable other selves. I am this act as it becomes the site of practice, the recipient of Kierkegaard's religious inwardness, and also its theory-text within context with the text that is the human persons, with you and me as narrative constructs as practitioners in coexistential attunement. Their accouplement (Ricoeur) or Maturana's structural coupling, or as Husserl called it the mutual confirmation of its communal being in the transition from being unto becoming that is, in fact, self-actualization, but also desiring each other's desire as self-desire, and actively creating possibilities by being-in-truth.

In the in-between spaces of being and not being as metonyms of life, with the possibility that in their be(com)ing, if perfection is potential and their essentiality, what becomes their human existence is the change they initiate from potentiality into actuality. By virtue of the soul becoming active intellect, and its actualizing potential, which is their permanent locus, it would want living in the dialectical relationship of Nietzsche's nothingness and everything, becoming and being. Otherwise, it is passive, and then, what is this "quintessence of dust"?

I also know that without spirit (divine positive Force) and the "structural coupling" of our spirit and matter (Maturana), and the change we bring from potentiality into actuality, we are nothing but "quintessence of dust" (Shakespeare, *Hamlet*) before our final nothingness. Both matter and spirit in humans are coexistent, arising as the ultimate pair in the necessity of each other's existence. Their "structural coupling" as a unit organization, creates the urge and becomes the ultimate necessity for 'being unto becoming' in the "unity of process" (Iqbal), that is the living system. Without becoming, being is mere being. It is there and not there. 'Becoming' changes that potentiality into actuality, and becomes the human being's mode of processual manifestation. 'Being' needs the *muharrik* (mover) that may be inside or outside the *mutaharrik*/ body (the

moved) for *harkat* (motion) to be actualized. ‘Being unto becoming’ is therefore, a correlate, and matter and spirit are each other’s need and arise out of need, want and desire for manifestation, recognition, acceptance and acknowledgement.

It is the intended intention and much desired will, action and hope, confirmation and actualization of the belief that progress is essentially a progression from ‘being unto becoming’ human. This is the responsibility of a fully awakened human consciousness. And the praxis of this moral/ethical respons(e)ability is the central curriculum of being *enlightened*. Its translation into a moral/ethical action will act against injustice and inequitable practices. This can truly become the basic foundational construct of an imposing Real humane civilization, creatively reConstructed by “a corresponding civilizational discipline” (Swimme, 1999), which I firmly believe is the rich domain of Education the world over. It is affirmed by Huebner’s (1999) insightful co-combine of Education and Spirituality, and its provoking curriculum: “Education is only possible because the human being is a being that can transcend itself.” (p. 345)

But practice seems to justify the idea of humans as belonging to their non-human kin, and bears witness to my verbal construct–hum/animal. Being mere owners of that passive intellect has evinced from us corrosive behavior and inhuman acts that show no sign of moral/ spiritual consciousness. Our unbecoming attitude to lesser humans, animals and nature as strangers, does not justify our right to rule all creation. Our “alleged exceptional status” (Kohak) is in no way justification for misuse of rights in a democratic universe. What a show of humanity is made by considering ourselves fully human, and those *not really human* or at least *not altogether human* when we have transgressed from becoming human. We have remained human in body by the mere possession or suppression of those signs of humanity so graciously given at birth.

The problem here is of becoming human, and mankind’s elimination of inhumanity to humans and animals and nature to earn the qualitative distinction of being the humankind. We must set ourselves free of the idea of human superiority and let grace

*soften our heart and soul,
for so unhardened
we shall become living grace
for tomorrow’s ambrosia*

or otherwise what is this quintessence of dust if s/he strives not for change and transformation, whose seeds are innately present within by virtue of the signs of humanity, and consciously

*mutate into atavistic form
that still walk on bare feet
and straight,
learn, then unlearn the art of humanity.*

Our human ‘being’ is undoubtedly manifested in the progression of civilization. But it is in our human ‘becoming’ that the fruits of no modern/postmodern, but a positive humane civilization will be accrued, accumulated and rejoiced. Wherein lies the confirmation or qualification of this act?

Much lies in human intellect and creative imagination, and compassionate being in ethical relationships, and the most vital cause for such growth we must seek in our essential moral nature. “One touch of nature makes the whole world kin” (Kohak), but the touch, which does so is that of moral nature, its sensibility for transcendence and inclusion, the Spirit by which it has been created, and by which it has breath and is breathing. It is in this, and by virtue of this vitality and its active, creative performance, that humans will have the greatest unity in time amidst the many differences and contradictions of will, intention and desire of nations, governments, races and religions. Their essential spiritual base is the central inspiration, the “locus of permanence” (Shalom) with its centrality of power, which holds human species together in the community of an elemental spiritual life. And like understanding, the object of understanding, that may be any textual meaning and context, will have as Madison (1988) says

a temporal mode of being, which is to say that it is ever in the process of becoming and thus (like Merleau-Ponty’s “Being”) never fully is. It is not something fully determinate, unchanging, timeless, eternally the selfsame. (p. 34)

We are not mathematical things that exist of necessity (Aristotle), but beings with our quality as “knowing beings” to be perfected as “acting beings” (Ricoeur) engaged in productive activity called life. With this life,

all ideas become understandable and understood in manifold languages by the human race as we are of the same sect, the sect of Creator since time immemorial, with all relations belonging to the same Spiritual tree.

A little more of pure Relationship

The possibility of a large communion is based on the reality of internal relations (Griffins, 1990). It is our spiritual/spirited living that can bring the entire human creation together on one sure footing: *the humanness of human being*. Our essential nature, whatever our contrarities, brings us together on one sure footing, and is the key to the whole of human nature without which the numberless diversities of humans would be meaningless, and spiritual peace, a far cry. Only by letting expressions of moral/spiritual enthusiasm manifest themselves in acts of goodness, love and beauty to humanity, and then, seeing how meaningful language electrifies our heart, word brightens our intellect, and that, which had been dark and blank, is filled with light, meaning and purpose.

Our moral uprightness and spiritual living (morally and transcendentally as envisioned by Huebner) will be the most impressive and intelligible cue of our high status as *ashraf ul makhluqat* (the crown of creation) expressed happily in the beauty of our smiling faces. We should let that smiling optimism prevail, and our hearts beat with passion and pathos for sorrow, suffering, pain, and bring forth such healthful music that ends all the ills of humanity. The passions of mind must conceive with love and compassion the consciousness of all humanity, and that compassionate heart and soul sustain our link to the Divine Giver by whose loving Rahimi (Compassionate) Heart we are sustained, and by whose Inspiration, we alone have here a beautiful life. Intuitive insight and loving compassion needs to see these *deep* and *sacred* connections, and so continue building interconnections for the human community that make mode, act, and principle a rejoicing and celebration of worship and duty to humans, animals, nature, to the Creator who is Universal Love and Compassion. This is the romance of the imagining mind, compassionate imagination and imaginative love.

This romance flows from the Source and is also our spiritual filament and fundament. With this understanding, there can be no “rational justification of aggression” (Kohak, 1999), and consequent transgression in the march of civilization. This right is our fundament, and stands in direct ethical relation to us. It is not an object but a relational You to our ‘I’--subject of

the Subject-Spirit formation in I-You relation. As an invitation of this relation, revelation of mysteriousness begins and, only in observing and living this relation with all of you, is this holy mystery solved. Here relation vibrates in silence when I hears no You and yet feels addressed; I answers, thinking and doing acts of trust in bodily worship; with spiritual being remembering and living the I-You relation and feeling the change.

You is our essence and our beginning; in each of us we perceive a breath of You; in every you and me, we address the eternal You, in every sphere, according to its manner that becomes our mode of existence and the infinite relation with spiritual things that darkness vibrates, stillness acts, silence speaks, according to its manner, and so the growing continues, with gentle affection, strong will and grace

Contemplative thinking, and observing with Wilber's (1990) contemplative Eye tell us that the spiritual universe is not running down, but lives with numinous energy and synergy for transformative experiences. ConTexts further that Ricoeur understands to be "our self-understanding for what we essentially are is what we can become, the being otherwise and being more that are the objects of effort and desire, the two basic characteristics of the act of existing." (in Madison, 1988, p. 96)

Actually, we humans have formed other living systems and dependencies that are materially opulent, appear dynamic, and therefore possess us completely, making light and ethereal things as Spirit non-visible, opaque or occult. Spirit is living and immanent, right here and available, obvious and present. For furthering evolution and progression of human spirit that is within, it is those who will to know and receive in the spirit of evolution, and have potential for "climbing the ladder" (The Essential Kabbalah, 1996) toward wisdom and understanding, even higher levels of consciousness. But, engrossed in our uncreative reaction to the finite world and consumed by our worldly desires and limited consciousness, the creativity operation *ens perfectissimus* is left unperformed, checked and therefore, not much known. What is to be known is the evolution of holistic progression that is stupendous, inspiring, pointing to the unknown "worlds" beyond the stars, the Quran points to, and Dr. Mohammed Iqbal images in his poetry:

**Sitaron se aage jahan aur bhi hein
Abhi ishq ke imtehan aur bhi hein**

And Browning's similar poetic reminder:

Yet, ah! that man's reach should exceed his grasp
Or, what's heaven for?

Embodying Uniqueness

The Spirit's many manifestations as objective Nature, subjective Mind and absolute Spirit (Ken Wilber, 1998) are always present around us and within us, waiting for recognition, encounter, and embrace. To Wilber (1998): "Spirit is the process of its own self-actualization and self-unfolding; its being is its own becoming: its Goal is the Path itself" (p. 108). The path is already open for the Marriage of Sense and Soul, and its exquisite embodiment in creative works as the best expression. It exemplifies Gadamer's passionate concern with Education in *Truth and Method*:

as a means of procedure of behavior, -----of Being having Become----- to remain open for the other in the work of art or the past. This is precisely what we, following Hegel, have stressed as the general characteristic of education: to remain open for the alien, for other more general perspectives. [Education] thus contains a general sense for the measure and distance in terms of oneself and insofar as surpassing of oneself toward the general. (cited in Zimermann & Klassen, 2000, p. 8)

This, I firmly believe, is the quintessence of Education, the systemic divine created by the "wisely wise" humans for humans always, "a 'generative' discipline" that David W. Jardine envisioned as bringing forth "new life," meaning it has a touch of transcendence and inclusion, and promises continuity because of its re-generativity. Such transcendence comes when Transcendence continually moves the human potentials (mind, body and spirit) that empower humans to overreach their self by always becoming. Potential of lumen superius is emulating the divine for the love of God. So "Imitate your Creator" and delight the Divine Heart by acting compassionately. And so Matt (1994) professes: "For the essence of the divine image is action." Potential is also for each human holon as a whole/part phenomenon to develop and outreach as its own agency or fitting in with the other holons that are an integral part of

the human system. Human power thus lies in actualizing this potency in creative acts, such as forming an extensive web of relationships, and in maintaining holistic relationship as agency/communion. Human being's empirical test is of *remembering* and *actualizing* that summum bonum principle--"its being is its own becoming" (Wilber). Its goal is the ascending path etching deeply into the being of the holon world that shows up in the iYus mesmeric attachment.

My experiential conception of Relation

The experiential foundation or conception of Relation evolves from relation as it really is. As Paul Ricoeur puts it, something must be for something to mean. Its existence prior to meaning is preemptive to understanding. Is it not the same as Sartre's existence precedes thought? Therefore, relation must be for it to mean something. For me relation is and brings forth an image of relation that it symbolizes. Its very being is becoming and self-explanatory. Relation that exists with representations other than 'self and others' is not relation. It should be isolation or separation, reification of self-exclusivity and Individualism. What consumes persons or things in a kind of connection or correspondence is the 're,' this living prefix that carries the spell of the sensuous sensitivity to the meaning it spells out even before we encounter it. Relation is and everywhere, everywhen and evermore for everyone existing in nature and the natural domain of this "All-nourishing" Source, and will naturally come on us as an encounter between I and you or thou as Martin Buber (1996) uses it. Its sacredness evicts reception and response that is for all to enter into our relational dynamics for that "flow of molecules" (Maturana, 2001) to continue. This flow is the determining factor of relation and its consequent interflow, and then the transflow that occurs.

This, I believe, is the natural behavior of existing and experiencing elements in that moment of relational space. The beauty of that flow and transflow is indebted to the flow of Spirit in all things as we flow perennially in the great flow of being and becoming. Nothing stops, or happens not in this explorelational domain. This essential "structural coupling" (Maturana) contributes to an ever-growing web of relations, when some configuration or shifting configuration happens to these, that really becomes relation. But, more significant is the coming together of our internal presence with other presences in emotional encounters, and most importantly, "the practicing presence of God" (Huebner) that is causal to our co-emergence in transformative coupling. It is at this point

of mystical reciprocity, and our living this reciprocity in connected nearness (*qurb*), that a true sense of identity and relation are brought into focus, issuing forth *qarar* that only *qurb* brings. Resisting encounters and relations is a reductionist concept and unhelpful. Whatever the explanation or what helps most is continuing encounters with gladden gracious hearts, and our stepping out of our isolation with rekindled confidence, assertion and sense of direction. Since it is coming from the candlelit heart and carries Essence whose essence is Love, it addresses matters of consequence.

Nothing happens because the consequences of its happenings are necessary at the moment in which it happens. (Maturana, 2001)

If nothing happens, it is because we fear to its becoming that we don't know, or discontinue it for its lack of emotional accompaniment, or deliberately disallow ourselves of the possibility of becoming the beautiful human as bemoaned by Ghalib:

Aadmi ko bhi moyesar nahin insaan hona.

In continuous encounter between you and me, a certain emotioning is necessary (Maturana, 2001). The intimacy or *qurb* (nearness) it generates is likely to incorporate a *special emotioning* based on "faith that has our humanity as its foundation" (Buber), and for the effectual configuration and fulfillment that it brings in the being of humans, it has the opportune favour to be called Love.

Any relation that bears resemblance to this fine encounter is bound to be a loving relationship. Imagine the soft, warm pleasure or sensuous plasma that pulsates through all things, and is always here and available to soul mates for which, a willing submission and suspension of disbelief is paramount. The resulting effulgence is epiphanies, I becoming you, you becoming me, both coexisting as *we* with our human individuality and humanity. This encounter has meaning and informs a meaningful way of being and becoming soul mates. It is in such encounters that the Other changes into Intimate, the world stands still and makes itself known to us with such clarity and spirit that we are assured that this vision, no matter how brief, is worth the lifetime. It captures us for beginning as Huebner (1999) calls the *curriculum for individuality* (p. 233). If only---

Encounter?

For educational insights, encounter is paramount, as it arises from the direct experience of You as immanent, a real consciousness, an encounter with the holy, a sacred Presence transcending I and you as eternal You, God, Spirit-Source and Creator of all realities, and yet within here and ever. Real consciousness or inwardness brings us in direct mystical relation to You in soul to soul encounter that is the initiating, stoking principle of humane existence and human connections. This relation is continuing because of our sacred basic essence and the consciousness that we share the same matter and essence.

This coalescence is experience in step with our innate grounding. This becomes the basis of our relational dynamics and structure of the human cosmos. Remoteness from You and all yours will be our ungrounding. This simple relationing in the event of encounter is demanding. The human presence as embodied being becomes real as words of deed actualize in the creative relationship that follows. Seeking the re-creation of the form, which is represented in the soul of the disciple, is identical to that which is represented in the instructor's soul, and once the disciple knows this and through the knowledge of their instructor, a deep primordial trust is formed. Both in silent agreement at their arrival know as Tusi (1998) knew that "there will be no differentiation and multiplicity between their souls; and once the veil is removed, they reach their instructor" (p. 46), and are united with the instructor's oneness, knowing their identical arrival and return. *This is the base from which any kind of instruction can be done.* This is my world-view and my vocational philosophy in education. What keeps me grounded is the silent love of You always, present in word and act, encountering and embracing You that gives meaning to life, life's quest and inspiration to many becoming pursuits. This is nourishment, and is the breath of creativity.

All actual life is encounter, thinks Martin Buber (1996).

Encounter is the matrix of actual life. I speaks and perceives that it is only in the direct, unmediated, warm presence of the whole being in person that encounter and relation exist. In the presentness of this presence, actual life begins with *you and me* in the warm embrace of a *living connection*. The substantiating 'and' between *you and me* forms the relation and reveals the transcending quality of the relation as I transcends I and you transcend you--both transforming while retaining our human

individuality, and moving toward something new and wonderful--our humanity. So humans, desiring transcendence experiences, need to know that this will touch us only through givingness.

This is a spiritual engagement that has immense potential for change in education with the initial teachings in our heart. If only all humans and most importantly, teachers and their students will see contemplatively the nature of this natural relationship, and will give a natural, intelligent and understanding response. How hard we must battle against ratiocinative forces needs a constant reminder of our humble origin, and a continuing spiritual resurgence through sincere practice and compassionate action. It educes a refreshing way of sacred being that lives in remembering and reconceptualizing the old ways of seeing and being, unmediated, spontaneous ways of teaching with heart and soul, and the Socratic spirit, and then moving ahead with that light--in this lies our becoming human. Our becoming as human beings is indicative of an experiential *reconception of relation namely teacher-student relations*, and eventually, depending upon such continuing insightful experiences, it will see human ascent in our being. Of course, our willful choice pulses life into all human relationships. Here, there are colours and sounds, becomings and intensities, Pinar agrees, and also the need to function "self-transformatively." (Pinar & Grumet, 1976)

Despite material progress and the subsequent power that humans have acceded to, and the sense of power they have access to, the precariousness of human life is around them and threatens them. Human finiteness ever comes back upon us with the nature of reality, infinitely reminding us of Death, but also of Nature as manifestation and work of another kind, providing humans with resurgence and continuity in the face of threatening circumstantial life. This will continually remind us of each other's humble origin and inspire us to think always of our sacred Relations, and so live in empathic harmony and respectful regard of each other. For life to continue, a sense of giving and caring attitude will be life enhancement, and will bring soul enlargement. As God's creation and creation's intimates, we must share deep thought in the joy of life, which from without appears to Kohak and seeing beings, as voluntary simplicity, and who respect it and work for its sustainable development. If this is spiritual care, it has to be like this and nothing else.

If only we care---- to own responsibility for culturing the world with compassionate imagination and contemplative knowing by the aesthetics

of the good, the beautiful and the true, and by learning to learn and live, and give the meaning, significance and value of life with clear conscience and emotional generosity. Living with *pure transparent humanness* is the gift of sacred life and beautiful living, and nonetheless, our receiving happiness and contentment as the legitimate other. This is the philosophy of praxis and the moral end of education--soul awakening and enjoyment as befitting means of our soul enhancement. Here ecology comes closest to ethics and joins pedagogy as a fine tripartite combine to become eco-pedagogical ethics. Its task is not teaching from pedagogical heights, but transforming teaching and learning into a living experience that is not without culture, spirit and sense. Its impact will be subtle and in/forming--the inner transformation of humans by signs of humanity so that human learners share 'being and becoming' that points a way to T. S. Eliot's unity of being, a source of well being and becoming well. In such a fusion, intuitive insight and moral control coalesce, and will afford buoyancy to the young learners in the persistent journey of their life. Evoking a notion of educational journey and a sense of 'moreness' should be a teacher's stoking principle. This is a teacher's hidden desire in her or his practice and optimal hope.

And hope, says Shakespeare, is the first step to love. And the best that a teacher does in education is to hope most by making learning insightful and enjoyable, and relating it with life and the world so that our students read the peculiar and distinctive experiences in texts for their value to humankind. They will also see their own merit in the texts' meaning and significance, and make connections with this experience, thus becoming partakers in a life that is larger, richer and more varied. Teachers' presence is a means of amplifying experience and extending their contact with all humans before them and beyond their personal lot. This is what all knowing, teaching and learning is about--a peculiar and distinctive experience of and for iYus. And perhaps I should call this the philosophy of my eco-pedagogical concerns as the sacred culture of humanity.

Here it operates at the edge of poetry turning the immediacy of experience that abides intentionally in

*one minute's luxury of absolute amness.
I could spend a whole lifetime
luxurying amness
but for the inalienable becoming,
always aware of being within word and the world,
also reaching out to becoming advertently;*

but inadvertently, more relishing so.

This advertent and inadvertent becoming has been the central vision of the human beings who committed themselves to wisdom, understanding and knowledge--the qualitative distinction for an authentic and quality relationship. Added is the intoxication of the purity of heart and soul for educators and their commitment to the joy of learning and teaching, and giving this joy to their students as the expression of their love for everyone. It will work miracles and create oases for our brown existence on this beautiful Earth again, our home, true to the kindred point of heaven. This is to me the sacred ethological curriculum of Education, and the hidden culture of Spirituality.

In-between what we also see is the tragedy of human action that matters. That is worth worrying about, and serious and solicitous enough to purge the human soul of 'too much' of everything, and bring it good sense through its troubled groping to find the hidden springs within. Hence the marvels of the human spirit and Hamlet's echo of Antigone's chorus "What a piece of work is man!"

What philosophical research tells us is to grope farther and seek the wonderment of 'Essence-sense' relationship, or live the tragedy of the human soul, without knowing that "the nobler the soul is, more objects of compassion it hath." This compassion is the very essence of a rendering of human life both serious and true, along with it the definite attitude which this narrative embodies: the eternal contradiction where

*Human hangs between, in doubts, to act or rest,
In doubt to deem self divine or beast,
In doubt mind or body to prefer,
Born with spirit and sense but to defer,
Created to rise, reconfiguring fall,
Sole knower of truth, fictive withal,
i nuncupates other's will, non being,
Disavowing living, i non-living.
Is this transgressing, progressive being?
or progressing just is, as living is
for a strange changeling at interstitial
space and crossed time, within.*

This is the experiential **dialectic** of relationship, and through the spiritual fundament of Transcendence, a permanent human connection is born. And yet, not all meetings can occur in this ethos. Whatever the case, humane sense and a very careful handling and persistent caring serve as light. “Light upon Light!”

Glossary

Amness. A state of active being between no being and not being, a contradiction of non- being, death-in-life, a state of status quo, of spiritual paralysis.

Dialectic. Taking dialectic as a wholistic method characterized by both positive and negative totalities, the dialectical process enters a new dynamics of self-reflection that leads to a fundamental transformation of the phenomena and persons engaged in the process of dialectical interpenetration. It is a process, which enables one to observe different categories or forms of consciousness arise out of each other to form ever more inclusive totalities. Love is one such flow and dialectical engagement that realizes “open totality” (Roy Bhaskar, 1993) until the system of categories or forms as a whole is completed, implying a life-long loving commitment and *tapashya* of transformation in the process of human Becoming.

Enlightenment. A dis-identification from ego in identity terms, and an all-encompassing perception of non-separation. It is the awareness that we are one, interconnected on mental, emotional, physical and spiritual levels or stations, contained by and directly extended from the One central Essence that gives rise to the universe and existence itself. We are one extended family of the Creator as Creation, and with knowledge and reason as the valid way to faith and God-consciousness, and receiving a gift of quiescence.

Individuation. The conscious choosing by the ego to relate to the Self, resulting in increasing sense of wholeness and a feeling of health, that is “unity of being” to T.S.Eliot. This is the process by which the individual moves from knowledge to greater knowledge of Self, by transcendence and inclusion. It is a conscious way of the creative being--in the evolutionary process of always becoming--forever! By being on this road

to individuation, the human individual consciously crosses over egoic separation, mundane existence and personal self, and rises from limitations of self to larger selfhood. It is a process of attaining fuller selfhood, a state of self-knowledge by relating to as many separate selves because of the sacred connection. And then, by making personal identity less dense, thinning out into transparent selflessness, an image of *pure transparent humanness*, that is becoming the representative 'I.' This is the serving individual of Dr. Muhammed Iqbal.

Prospice. In Latin means 'looking forward.' Appears in Robert Browning's poem by this name.

Qarar. Word in the Urdu language containing peace, serenity and calmness of the soul, an inner stability or quiescence that harmonizing with the outer and other brings. It comes with the attainment of *qurb* (nearness), a sense of fullness and fulfilment.

Self. The archetype of wholeness and the centre of the psyche. Jung saw the Self as the divine imago, the image of God within the human psyche. In ancient belief-systems, God is the Central Consciousness or Higher Self, the Oneness, non-dualistic Being that is the Source, the dependent origination of all conscious beings, whose divine Unity or Unitive Consciousness represents the resolution of all dualities. This Self is the same as Iqbal's *Khudi* concept in *The Mysteries of Selflessness*.

Self-realization. Experiencing and permanently actualizing direct knowledge of the Self, or God, making this more real than the apparent 'realness' of the world.

self-realization. Understanding self as a non-separatist individual, constantly in relation to the Self and existing with God-consciousness, and through this Source always connected with the whole creation in the body's axis or heart centre.

Soul. Individual aspect of Spirit, guiding life on earth; the inner presence of this Spirit in the human centre, deep within, an integral essential part of the subtle bodies.

Reference

i) Ghalib: a 19th century poet of the Indian Subcontinent, wrote largely about human suffering, and the pathic of affection and strong will in humanity.

ii) ashraf-ul-makhluqat: *Makhluqat* is plural of *makhluq*, living beings, the creation, and *ashraf* means supreme or foremost with its implications for humankind to be the crown of creation. *Makhluqat* also carries the notion of emerging as the act of creation that is *takhleeq* with Creation as the work of Creator.

1. Education: The aim of life for a believer, in the Islamic faith, is to get self-realization or self-perfection for a fruitful ever after (Dictionary of Islamic Terms). In order to achieve that end, education is necessary. Education consists of religious and non-religious learning that is necessary to remove the darkness that clouds the way and ensnares existence. It is the light that provides access to the inner and outer worlds, and empowers us intellectually and spiritually. Both are of paramount importance so as to end *jahiliya* (ignorance), and have to be integrated in life as a network of norms that spreads into the personal and back again to the communal. Deliverance from ignorance is stressed, and journey to attain this end boundless and without boundaries, promising the learned to act up to her/his learning and teach it to others, and thus be enviable. Every book compiled for moral advancement brings ever-recurring reward, and whoever treads the path of knowledge walks into heaven, and whoever dies in the pursuit of knowledge, is a martyr. The learned are the heritage of the Prophets, and there will be but one step between them and the Prophets. These are words of the holy Prophet Muhammad, (peace be upon him) with the Quranic injunction that “none but men of understanding are mindful.” Therefore, hermeneutics comes naturally into the human context, whereby wisdom is a “great good” only when actualized in culture and actions that are beneficial to humankind. This is causal to illumination that ends darkness, and spreads light through knowledge and truth.

2. The basic thought comes from Inspirational writings, and philosophical literature (classical Islamic writings) which had its origins in the first Arabic translations and adaptations of ancient Greek texts, notably the political writings of Plato and Aristotle. Aristotle’s potentiality and actuality postulate articulates this interest. See Kraemer, J. (1986) for more about Islamic humanism.

3. Albert Shalom, a metaphysician of Subjectivity. For more reading, refer to Subjectivity in *Review of Metaphysics*, Vol. xxxviii, no. 2, Dec. 1984.

4. Miskawayh: Abu Ali Ahmed Muhammad Yaqub Miskawayh (Muskuya) al-Khazin (the “Custodian”)--historian, philosopher, physician, secretary, librarian, courtier--was born in 325/936 in Ray and died on 9 Safar 421/16 February 1030 in Isfahan. His *al-Fawz al-Ashgar* was published in Beirut 1319/1901. See F. Rosenthal, “On the Knowledge of Plato’s Philosophy in the Islamic world,” (398 - 402) where these arguments are traced to Proclus’ Commentary on Plato’s *Phaedo*. Miskawayh’s principle of natural sociability is about his *jihad al-nafs* that is the permanent war between man [sic] and his lower drives. It emphasizes upon educators the desirability to teach children about love and harmony, hence a revival of humanistic education that is connected with “true paidea” (*al-adab al-haqq*), guiding them in sound habits and salutary actions, in line with prophets, who are physicians of souls. See Goodman, *Morals and Society in Islamic Philosophy*, in Kraemer, (1986).

5. Nasir al-Din Tusi (*Contemplation and Action*, 1998) talks about the seeker’s quest and the principle/ method of this quest. So I understand that in this world, no one who seeks something can reach her/his goal unless, first of all, s/he has some capital of the same kind as that which s/he seeks, and subsequently makes the necessary effort. Tusi gives the example: “unless a farmer sows seed and cultivates the land, he can have no harvest; if a merchant has no capital and does no business, he makes no profit;” Similarly, unless a teacher gains knowledge and practices and teaches that knowledge, s/he makes no career. It can be understood on Tusi’ insight: “the seeker after perfection attains a favor from the primordial decree,” which is equivalent to the farmer’s seeds--that is, have a pure soul and a sincere heart. And unless s/he has “acquired something from the subsequent decree,” which is equivalent to the farmer’s harvest, and “yokes both of these together and immerses the subsequent in the primordial,” s/he cannot find self-realization or perfection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Buber, M. (1966b). *The Way of Response: Martin Buber; Selections From His Writings*. New York: Schocken Books.

_____. (1970). *I and Thou*. New York: Touchstone.

Calvino. (1985). *Mr. Palomar*. (Trans. Harcourt Brace). Jovanovich, Inc.

Goodman, L. E. (1994). *Morals and Society in Islamic Philosophy*. New York: Routledge.

Griffin, D. R. (Ed.). (1990). *Sacred Interconnections*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Grumet, M. & Pinar, W. (1976). *Toward a poor curriculum: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Currere*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Huebner, D. (1999). *Education and Spirituality*. In Hills, V., (Ed.), *The Lure of the Transcendent*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Iqbal, M. (1996). *The Reconstruction Of Religious Thought In Islam*. Lahore, Pakistan: Sang-e-Meel Publications.

Jardine, D. (1992). Reflections on Education, Hermeneutics, and Ambiguity: Hermeneutics as a Restoring of Life to Its Original Difficulty. In Reynolds, (Ed.) *Understanding Curriculum as Phenomenological and Deconstructed Text*. New York: NY Teachers College Press.

Kohak, E. (1999). *The Green Halo. A Bird's Eye View of Ecological Ethics*. Chicago, Ill.: Open Court Publishing Co.

Kraemer, J. W. (2000). *Healing and Cosmology*. Published papers in *Ethnopsychologische Mitteilungen*, Band 9, # 1/2, pp. 109-148.

- Madison, G. B. (1988). *The Hermeneutics of Postmodernity: Figures and Themes*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Matt, D. C. (1995). *The Essential Kabbalah*. San Francisco: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- Maturana, H. R. (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Maturana, H. R. & Verden- Zoller, G. (2001). *The Origin of Humanness in the Biology of Intimacy*. For the Remaining Human Seminar, University of British Columbia, Van. BC, Spring 2001.
- Schafer, R. (1978). *Language and Insight*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Schurman. (1978). *Meister Eckhart*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University.
- Shalom, A. (1984). Subjectivity. *Review of Metaphysics*, Vol. Xxxviii, (2), Dec. 1984, pp. 229-271. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- Swimme, B. (1999). *The Hidden Heart of the Cosmos*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Wilber, K. (1990). *Eye to Eye*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- _____. (1998). *The Marriage of Sense and Soul*. New York: Random House.
- Zimmermann, J. & Klassen, N. (Ed.). (2000). *Institutional Readings: Towards an Understanding of the Universe: The Institution, Humanism and the Ethical Understanding*. Workshop Paper, University of British Columbia, Van. BC. March 8, 2000.
- Zurayk,C.K.(1968). *Miskawayh: The Refinement of Character*. Beirut: Centennial Publications