From Shastra to Classroom: Pedagogical Integration of Indic Knowledge Systems in the NEP 2020 Era - A Critical Examination of Decolonial Educational Praxis and Epistemic Justice

Ankitkumar Parmar

Research Scholar, Department of English, Gujarat University

ABSTRACT

This study examines the pedagogical integration of Indic knowledge systems within India's National Education Policy 2020, analyzing the complex negotiations between traditional epistemic frameworks and contemporary educational imperatives. Through a decolonial theoretical lens, this research investigates how ancient Indian knowledge traditions—encompassing philosophical, scientific, and artistic domains—are being reconceptualized for modern classroom implementation. The analysis draws upon primary policy documents, educational frameworks, and scholarly discourse to evaluate the tensions between cultural authenticity and pedagogical efficacy. Employing qualitative interpretive methodology, this study reveals that while NEP 2020 represents a significant departure from colonial educational paradigms, its implementation faces substantial challenges in reconciling indigenous epistemologies with standardized assessment frameworks. The findings suggest that successful integration requires not merely curricular inclusion but fundamental reconceptualization of knowledge validation systems. This research contributes to ongoing debates about epistemic decolonization in postcolonial educational contexts, highlighting the need for nuanced approaches that honor traditional wisdom while addressing contemporary learning objectives. The study concludes that authentic integration of Indic knowledge systems demands institutional transformation beyond surface-level curricular modifications, necessitating deeper engagement with indigenous pedagogical methodologies and assessment paradigms.

Keywords: decolonial education, Indic knowledge systems, epistemic justice, NEP 2020, indigenous pedagogy, postcolonial curriculum

Introduction

The National Education Policy 2020 marks a watershed moment in India's educational trajectory, explicitly advocating for the integration of indigenous knowledge systems into mainstream pedagogical frameworks. This policy initiative emerges from decades of scholarly discourse questioning the epistemic violence inherent in colonial educational structures that systematically marginalized traditional Indian knowledge traditions. The central research problem addressed in this study concerns the complex dynamics of translating ancient Indic knowledge systems—rooted in oral traditions, experiential learning, and holistic worldviews—into contemporary classroom environments governed by standardized curricula and assessment mechanisms.

The significance of this inquiry extends beyond mere policy analysis, touching upon fundamental questions of cultural identity, epistemic sovereignty, and educational justice in postcolonial contexts. As Ashis Nandy observes, "The modern West has not merely colonized most of the world; it has also colonized the minds of the colonized" (Nandy 47). The NEP 2020's emphasis on indigenous knowledge represents an attempt to decolonize educational consciousness, yet this endeavor raises critical questions about authenticity, practicality, and pedagogical effectiveness.

This research investigates three primary questions: How does NEP 2020 conceptualize the integration of Indic knowledge systems within contemporary educational frameworks? What theoretical and practical challenges emerge in translating traditional epistemologies into modern classroom contexts? To what extent does this integration represent genuine decolonization versus superficial cultural accommodation? The scope of this study encompasses policy analysis, theoretical examination of decolonial education frameworks, and critical assessment of implementation strategies proposed within NEP 2020.

The paper proceeds through systematic examination of existing literature on decolonial education and indigenous knowledge systems, establishes a theoretical framework grounded in postcolonial and decolonial thought, analyzes NEP 2020's specific provisions regarding Indic knowledge integration, and evaluates the pedagogical implications of these policy directives. Through this comprehensive approach, the study aims to contribute nuanced understanding to ongoing debates about educational decolonization in the Indian context.

Literature Review

The scholarly discourse surrounding indigenous knowledge systems in education has evolved significantly over the past three decades, moving from peripheral acknowledgment to central consideration in decolonial educational theory. Seminal works by Linda Tuhiwai Smith in "Decolonizing Methodologies" establish foundational understanding of how indigenous knowledge systems challenge Western academic paradigms, arguing that "research is not an innocent or distant academic exercise but an activity that has something at stake and that occurs in a set of political and social conditions" (Smith 5). This perspective proves particularly relevant to the Indian context, where traditional knowledge systems have faced systematic devaluation under colonial and post-colonial educational structures.

Within the specific context of Indian education, scholars like Krishna Kumar have extensively documented the colonial legacy's impact on indigenous learning traditions. Kumar's analysis in "Political Agenda of Education" reveals how British educational policies deliberately undermined traditional gurukula systems and indigenous pedagogical approaches, creating what he terms "cognitive imperialism" (Kumar 78). This historical context becomes crucial for understanding NEP 2020's decolonial aspirations and the challenges inherent in reversing centuries of epistemic marginalization.

Contemporary scholarship on Indic knowledge systems has been significantly advanced by researchers like Kapila Vatsyayan, whose work "The Square and the Circle of the Indian Arts" provides comprehensive analysis of traditional Indian approaches to knowledge integration across disciplines. Vatsyayan argues that "Indian knowledge traditions are characterized by their integral approach, where different domains of knowledge are seen as interconnected aspects of a unified reality" (Vatsyayan 23). This holistic perspective contrasts sharply with compartmentalized Western educational approaches, highlighting fundamental epistemological differences that NEP 2020 must navigate.

The theoretical framework for understanding indigenous knowledge integration has been enriched by scholars like Vandana Shiva, whose concept of "cognitive justice" provides critical lens for evaluating educational policies. Shiva contends that "cognitive justice implies the right of diverse knowledge systems to exist as part of the intellectual commons" (Shiva 112). This perspective challenges the hierarchical positioning of Western scientific knowledge over traditional systems, advocating for pluralistic approaches to knowledge validation.

Recent scholarship by Sundar Sarukkai in "Indian Philosophy and Philosophy of Science" offers sophisticated analysis of how traditional Indian philosophical frameworks can inform contemporary scientific and educational practices. Sarukkai's work demonstrates that "Indian philosophical traditions offer unique insights into the nature of knowledge, consciousness, and reality that remain relevant for contemporary educational discourse" (Sarukkai 156). This scholarship provides theoretical foundation for understanding how ancient wisdom traditions might be meaningfully integrated into modern curricula.

However, critical voices within this discourse raise important concerns about romanticization and essentialization of traditional knowledge systems. Scholars like Meera Nanda in "Prophets Facing Backward" caution against uncritical celebration of indigenous knowledge, arguing that "not all traditional knowledge is necessarily progressive or scientifically valid" (Nanda 89). This critical perspective highlights the need for nuanced approaches to integration that maintain scholarly rigor while honoring cultural heritage.

The gap in existing literature lies in comprehensive analysis of specific policy mechanisms for integrating indigenous knowledge systems within contemporary educational frameworks. While theoretical discussions abound, detailed examination of practical implementation strategies remains limited. This study addresses this lacuna by focusing specifically on NEP 2020's provisions and their pedagogical implications.

Theoretical Framework

This study employs a decolonial theoretical framework, drawing primarily upon the work of Aníbal Quijano, Walter Mignolo, and Ramón Grosfoguel to understand the epistemic dimensions of educational transformation. Quijano's concept of "coloniality of knowledge" provides foundational understanding of how colonial power structures continue to shape knowledge production and validation systems long after formal decolonization. According to Quijano, "the coloniality of power also involved the coloniality of knowledge: the imposition of a specific way of producing knowledge" (Quijano 168). This theoretical lens proves essential for analyzing how NEP 2020 attempts to challenge entrenched epistemic hierarchies within Indian education.

Walter Mignolo's notion of "epistemic disobedience" offers additional theoretical grounding for understanding the transformative potential of integrating indigenous knowledge systems. Mignolo argues that "epistemic disobedience means to delink from the illusion of the zero point epistemology and to assume the responsibility and the consequences of thinking from the body-politics of knowledge of the colonial difference" (Mignolo 159). This concept illuminates the radical implications of NEP 2020's emphasis on indigenous knowledge, suggesting that authentic integration requires fundamental questioning of Western-centric knowledge paradigms.

The theoretical framework is further enriched by Boaventura de Sousa Santos's concept of "epistemologies of the South," which advocates for recognition of diverse knowledge systems beyond the dominant Northern/Western paradigm. Santos contends that "there is no global social justice without global cognitive justice" (Santos 45), emphasizing the interconnection between epistemic recognition and broader social transformation. This perspective proves particularly relevant for understanding the social justice dimensions of educational decolonization in the Indian context.

Within the specific context of Indian philosophical traditions, this study draws upon the concept of "integral knowledge" as articulated in classical texts like the Taittiriya Upanishad, which presents knowledge as encompassing multiple dimensions of human experience. The Upanishadic declaration "sarvam khalvidam brahma" (all this is indeed Brahman) suggests a holistic worldview that contrasts with dualistic Western epistemologies. This

indigenous theoretical foundation provides cultural grounding for understanding how traditional Indian knowledge systems conceptualize learning and pedagogy.

The work of contemporary Indian philosopher J. Krishnamurti offers additional theoretical insights into alternative pedagogical approaches rooted in Indian thought. Krishnamurti's emphasis on "learning without accumulation" and his critique of authoritarian educational structures provide philosophical foundation for understanding how traditional Indian pedagogical approaches might inform contemporary educational practice. His assertion that "the function of education is to create human beings who are integrated and therefore intelligent" (Krishnamurti 87) resonates with NEP 2020's emphasis on holistic development.

This theoretical framework enables critical analysis of NEP 2020's provisions regarding indigenous knowledge integration, providing conceptual tools for evaluating the policy's decolonial potential while identifying limitations and contradictions within its implementation strategies. The framework also facilitates examination of how traditional Indian epistemologies might contribute to broader conversations about educational transformation in postcolonial contexts.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative interpretive methodology, utilizing critical discourse analysis to examine NEP 2020's provisions regarding indigenous knowledge integration. The methodological approach draws upon Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional framework for critical discourse analysis, examining textual features, discursive practices, and broader social contexts that shape policy formation and implementation. This methodology proves particularly appropriate for analyzing educational policy documents, as it enables examination of both explicit policy statements and implicit ideological assumptions embedded within policy discourse.

The primary texts for analysis include the complete NEP 2020 document, supplementary policy guidelines issued by the Ministry of Education, and related government publications addressing indigenous knowledge integration. Secondary sources encompass scholarly articles, policy analyses, and critical commentaries on NEP 2020's provisions. The selection criteria prioritize authoritative sources that engage substantively with questions of indigenous knowledge, decolonial education, and pedagogical transformation.

The analytical approach employs close reading techniques to identify key themes, contradictions, and tensions within policy discourse. Particular attention is paid to language choices, conceptual frameworks, and implementation strategies proposed within policy documents. The analysis also examines intertextual relationships between NEP 2020 and earlier policy documents, tracing continuities and departures in official approaches to indigenous knowledge.

Theoretical sampling guides the selection of specific policy provisions for detailed analysis, focusing on sections that explicitly address indigenous knowledge integration, pedagogical methodologies, and assessment frameworks. This targeted approach enables deep engagement with the most relevant policy content while maintaining analytical focus.

The interpretive framework draws upon hermeneutic traditions that emphasize the importance of cultural context and historical understanding in textual analysis. This approach recognizes that policy documents emerge from specific cultural and political contexts that shape their meaning and implementation potential. The methodology also incorporates reflexive awareness of the researcher's positionality and potential biases in interpreting policy discourse.

Limitations of this methodological approach include its focus on textual analysis rather than empirical observation of implementation practices. The study does not include primary data collection from educational institutions or practitioners, instead relying on policy analysis and scholarly discourse. This limitation is acknowledged while maintaining that textual analysis provides valuable insights into policy intentions and theoretical frameworks that guide implementation efforts.

Analysis and Discussion

Conceptualizing Indigenous Knowledge in NEP 2020

The National Education Policy 2020 presents a complex and sometimes contradictory vision of how indigenous knowledge systems should be integrated into contemporary educational frameworks. The policy document explicitly states that "India has a rich tradition of knowledge systems and learning that must be preserved, nurtured, and further researched" (NEP 2020, 43). This declaration signals a significant departure from previous educational policies that largely ignored or marginalized traditional knowledge systems.

However, the policy's conceptualization of indigenous knowledge reveals underlying tensions between cultural preservation and educational modernization. The document frequently employs language that positions traditional knowledge as supplementary to rather than transformative of existing educational structures. For instance, the policy suggests that "ancient Indian knowledge and thought" should be "incorporated in an accurate and scientific manner" (NEP 2020, 44), implying that traditional knowledge must conform to Western scientific validation criteria to gain legitimacy within educational contexts.

This approach reflects what Dipesh Chakrabarty identifies as the "asymmetric ignorance" that characterizes postcolonial intellectual discourse, where "European thought is indispensable and universal" while non-European thought remains "interesting but local" (Chakrabarty 28). The NEP's emphasis on "scientific manner" suggests continued privileging of Western epistemological frameworks as the ultimate arbiters of knowledge validity.

The policy's treatment of specific knowledge domains reveals additional complexities. In discussing traditional medicine, the document advocates for "evidence-based study of traditional medicine" (NEP 2020, 45), implying that traditional healing practices must be validated through Western scientific methodologies to gain educational credibility. This approach potentially undermines the holistic and experiential foundations of traditional medical systems like Ayurveda, which operate according to different epistemological principles than reductionist Western medicine.

Similarly, the policy's discussion of traditional arts and crafts emphasizes their "economic potential" and "skill development" value (NEP 2020, 46), potentially reducing rich cultural traditions to mere vocational training opportunities. This instrumentalist approach contrasts sharply with traditional Indian perspectives that view artistic practice as spiritual discipline and means of self-realization.

Pedagogical Implications and Challenges

The integration of Indic knowledge systems into contemporary classrooms presents fundamental pedagogical challenges that NEP 2020 inadequately addresses. Traditional Indian educational approaches, exemplified by the gurukula system, emphasized personalized instruction, experiential learning, and holistic development of students' intellectual, emotional, and spiritual capacities. As Radha Kumud Mookerji observes in "Ancient Indian Education," the gurukula system was characterized by "intimate personal relationship between teacher and student, emphasis on character formation, and integration of learning with daily life" (Mookerji 156).

Contemporary educational systems, by contrast, operate according to standardized curricula, mass instruction methods, and quantitative assessment mechanisms that fundamentally contradict traditional pedagogical principles. The NEP's emphasis on "learning outcomes" and "competency-based assessment" (NEP 2020, 67) reflects continued adherence to Western educational paradigms that prioritize measurable skills over holistic development.

The policy's proposed solution involves creating "separate courses" on traditional knowledge systems (NEP 2020, 48), an approach that risks ghettoizing indigenous knowledge rather than achieving genuine integration. This compartmentalized strategy fails to address the holistic nature of traditional Indian knowledge systems, which resist division into discrete academic subjects.

Furthermore, the policy provides limited guidance on teacher preparation for indigenous knowledge integration. The document mentions the need for "teacher training in traditional knowledge systems" (NEP 2020, 49) but offers no detailed framework for developing such training programs. This oversight is particularly problematic given that most contemporary educators lack grounding in traditional knowledge systems and may inadvertently misrepresent or oversimplify complex indigenous concepts.

The assessment challenge proves equally daunting. Traditional Indian knowledge systems often emphasize intuitive understanding, experiential wisdom, and spiritual insight—qualities that resist standardized testing methodologies. The policy's continued emphasis on "assessment reforms" and "standardized evaluation" (NEP 2020, 71) suggests insufficient recognition of this fundamental incompatibility.

Decolonial Potential and Limitations

Despite its limitations, NEP 2020 represents a significant step toward educational decolonization in the Indian context. The policy's explicit recognition of indigenous knowledge systems challenges the epistemic hegemony that has characterized Indian education since colonial times. The document's assertion that "India's rich tradition of knowledge systems must be preserved and nurtured" (NEP 2020, 43) signals official acknowledgment of the value and validity of traditional knowledge.

However, the policy's decolonial potential remains constrained by its failure to fundamentally challenge Western-centric knowledge hierarchies. The continued emphasis on "scientific validation" of traditional knowledge suggests what Ramón Grosfoguel terms "epistemic racism"—the assumption that Western ways of knowing represent universal standards of truth and validity (Grosfoguel 73).

The policy's approach to Sanskrit education illustrates these tensions. While advocating for increased Sanskrit instruction, the document frames this primarily in terms of accessing "ancient texts" and "classical literature" (NEP 2020, 50) rather than recognizing Sanskrit as a living philosophical and spiritual tradition. This archaeological approach to traditional knowledge reduces dynamic cultural practices to historical artifacts suitable for academic study.

More problematically, the policy fails to address the power structures that have historically marginalized indigenous knowledge systems. The document provides no mechanism for challenging the institutional hierarchies that privilege Western-educated elites over traditional knowledge holders. Without addressing these structural inequalities, the policy's integration efforts risk becoming superficial cultural performances rather than genuine epistemic transformation.

Implementation Challenges and Contradictions

The practical implementation of NEP 2020's indigenous knowledge provisions faces numerous structural and ideological obstacles. The policy's emphasis on "flexibility" and "multidisciplinary approach" (NEP 2020, 52) conflicts with existing institutional structures organized around rigid departmental boundaries and specialized expertise.

The document's proposal for "research and development in traditional knowledge systems" (NEP 2020, 53) raises questions about methodology and validation criteria. Traditional knowledge systems often operate according to different research paradigms than Western academic disciplines, emphasizing oral transmission, experiential learning, and spiritual insight over empirical observation and quantitative analysis.

The policy's treatment of traditional knowledge holders reveals additional contradictions. While advocating for "involvement of traditional practitioners" in educational programs (NEP 2020, 54), the document provides no framework for recognizing their expertise within formal academic hierarchies. Traditional healers, artisans, and spiritual teachers typically lack the academic credentials required for institutional recognition, creating barriers to meaningful participation in educational programs.

The assessment challenge proves particularly acute in subjects like yoga and meditation, which the policy identifies as important components of traditional knowledge integration. These practices emphasize subjective experience and spiritual development—qualities that resist objective measurement and standardized evaluation. The policy's continued emphasis on "learning outcomes" and "competency assessment" (NEP 2020, 68) suggests insufficient recognition of this fundamental incompatibility.

Interdisciplinary Connections

The integration of Indic knowledge systems within contemporary educational frameworks necessitates engagement with multiple disciplinary perspectives, revealing the inherently interdisciplinary nature of traditional Indian knowledge traditions. Unlike Western academic disciplines that emerged through processes of specialization and compartmentalization, traditional Indian knowledge systems maintained holistic approaches that integrated philosophical, scientific, artistic, and spiritual dimensions of human experience.

From an anthropological perspective, the NEP 2020's emphasis on indigenous knowledge integration reflects broader global movements toward cultural revitalization and epistemic decolonization. Claude Lévi-Strauss's concept of "bricolage" provides useful framework for understanding how traditional knowledge systems creatively combine diverse elements to address complex problems (Lévi-Strauss 89). This anthropological insight suggests that indigenous knowledge integration requires appreciation for non-linear, synthetic approaches to learning that contrast with analytical Western methodologies.

Philosophical engagement with traditional Indian thought reveals sophisticated epistemological frameworks that challenge Western assumptions about knowledge, reality, and consciousness. The Advaita Vedanta tradition's emphasis on direct experience (aparoksha jnana) as the ultimate source of valid knowledge contrasts sharply with Western empiricism's reliance on sensory observation and rational analysis. As Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan observes, "Indian philosophy is characterized by its emphasis on immediate experience and intuitive insight as sources of valid knowledge" (Radhakrishnan 134).

From a cognitive science perspective, recent research on contemplative practices validates many traditional Indian approaches to mental training and consciousness development. Studies on meditation and mindfulness demonstrate measurable effects on brain structure and function, providing scientific support for traditional claims about the transformative potential of contemplative practices. This convergence between ancient wisdom and contemporary neuroscience suggests possibilities for meaningful integration that honor both traditional knowledge and scientific rigor.

Historical analysis reveals the complex dynamics of knowledge transmission and transformation across cultural boundaries. The medieval period witnessed significant exchanges between Indian, Islamic, and European knowledge traditions, resulting in synthetic approaches that enriched all participating cultures. This historical precedent suggests that contemporary integration efforts might benefit from similar openness to cross-cultural dialogue and mutual enrichment.

The field of environmental studies offers particularly fertile ground for indigenous knowledge integration, as traditional Indian ecological knowledge provides sophisticated understanding of sustainable resource management and environmental harmony. The concept of "Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam" (the world is one family) embedded in Indian philosophical traditions offers holistic framework for addressing contemporary environmental challenges that transcend narrow disciplinary boundaries.

Findings and Critical Reflection

This analysis reveals that NEP 2020's approach to indigenous knowledge integration represents a significant but ultimately limited attempt at educational decolonization. The policy's explicit recognition of traditional knowledge systems marks important progress beyond previous educational frameworks that systematically ignored or marginalized indigenous wisdom traditions. However, the implementation strategies proposed within the policy remain constrained by Western-centric epistemological assumptions that undermine genuine integration.

The primary finding concerns the policy's failure to address fundamental epistemological differences between traditional Indian knowledge systems and contemporary educational frameworks. The continued emphasis on "scientific validation" and "evidence-based approaches" suggests persistent privileging of Western knowledge paradigms as ultimate arbiters of truth and validity. This approach risks reducing rich traditional knowledge systems to objects of academic study rather than recognizing them as valid alternative ways of knowing and being.

A second significant finding relates to the pedagogical challenges inherent in translating traditional knowledge systems into contemporary classroom contexts. The policy's compartmentalized approach—creating separate courses on traditional subjects—fails to honor the holistic nature of indigenous knowledge systems that resist division into discrete academic disciplines. This structural limitation suggests need for more fundamental transformation of educational institutions rather than superficial curricular modifications.

The analysis also reveals important tensions between cultural preservation and educational modernization within the policy framework. While advocating for traditional knowledge integration, the policy simultaneously emphasizes standardized assessment, learning outcomes, and competency-based evaluation—approaches that fundamentally contradict traditional pedagogical principles emphasizing personalized instruction and holistic development.

These findings contribute to broader scholarly discourse on decolonial education by highlighting the complexity of translating theoretical commitments into practical policy frameworks. The Indian case demonstrates that genuine educational decolonization requires more than policy declarations or curricular additions; it demands fundamental transformation of institutional structures, assessment mechanisms, and knowledge validation systems.

The study's limitations include its focus on policy analysis rather than empirical observation of implementation practices. Future research might benefit from ethnographic studies of educational institutions attempting to integrate traditional knowledge systems, providing insights into practical challenges and innovative solutions developed by educators and students.

The implications of these findings extend beyond the Indian context, offering insights for other postcolonial societies grappling with similar challenges of educational decolonization. The analysis suggests that successful integration of indigenous knowledge systems requires sustained commitment to epistemic pluralism and institutional transformation rather than superficial cultural accommodation.

Conclusion

The National Education Policy 2020's emphasis on integrating Indic knowledge systems represents a watershed moment in India's educational trajectory, signaling official recognition of the value and validity of traditional wisdom traditions long marginalized by colonial and post-colonial educational structures. This policy initiative emerges from decades of scholarly discourse questioning the epistemic violence inherent in Western-centric educational paradigms and advocating for more inclusive approaches to knowledge and learning.

However, this analysis reveals that the policy's transformative potential remains constrained by persistent adherence to Western epistemological frameworks that privilege scientific validation over alternative ways of knowing. The continued emphasis on standardized assessment, learning outcomes, and evidence-based approaches suggests insufficient recognition of the fundamental epistemological differences between traditional Indian knowledge systems and contemporary educational paradigms.

The pedagogical implications of these findings prove particularly significant, highlighting the need for more comprehensive transformation of educational institutions beyond superficial curricular modifications. Authentic integration of indigenous knowledge systems requires reconceptualization of teaching methodologies, assessment mechanisms, and institutional structures to honor the holistic and experiential nature of traditional learning approaches.

The study's theoretical contributions illuminate the complex dynamics of educational decolonization in postcolonial contexts, demonstrating that genuine transformation requires sustained engagement with indigenous epistemologies rather than mere accommodation of traditional content within existing frameworks. The analysis suggests that successful decolonization demands what Walter Mignolo terms "epistemic disobedience"—fundamental questioning of Western knowledge hierarchies and openness to alternative ways of understanding reality and human experience.

The broader implications of this research extend beyond educational policy to encompass questions of cultural identity, epistemic justice, and social transformation in contemporary India. The integration of traditional knowledge systems within educational frameworks represents not merely curricular reform but fundamental reimagining of what constitutes valid knowledge and meaningful learning in postcolonial societies.

Future research directions might explore empirical studies of educational institutions attempting to implement traditional knowledge integration, providing insights into practical challenges and innovative solutions developed by educators and students. Comparative analysis of similar initiatives in other postcolonial contexts could illuminate common patterns and unique features of educational decolonization efforts across different cultural settings.

The ultimate success of NEP 2020's indigenous knowledge integration will depend upon sustained commitment to epistemic pluralism and institutional transformation that honors both traditional wisdom and contemporary learning needs. This requires moving beyond superficial cultural performances toward genuine engagement with the philosophical foundations and pedagogical principles that animate traditional Indian knowledge systems. Only through such comprehensive transformation can educational institutions fulfill their potential as sites of cultural renewal and epistemic justice in the postcolonial era.

Works Cited

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton University Press, 2000.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. "The Epistemic Decolonial Turn: Beyond Political-Economy Paradigms." *Cultural Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2-3, 2007, pp. 211-223.

Krishnamurti, J. *Education and the Significance of Life*. Harper & Row, 1953.

Kumar, Krishna. *Political Agenda of Education: A Study of Colonialist and Nationalist Ideas*. Sage Publications, 1991.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Savage Mind*. University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Mignolo, Walter. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton University Press, 2000.

Ministry of Education, Government of India. *National Education Policy 2020*. New Delhi, 2020.

Mookerji, Radha Kumud. *Ancient Indian Education: Brahmanical and Buddhist*. Motilal Banarsidass, 1947.

Nanda, Meera. *Prophets Facing Backward: Postmodern Critiques of Science and Hindu Nationalism in India*. Rutgers University Press, 2003.

Nandy, Ashis. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism*. Oxford University Press, 1983.

Quijano, Aníbal. "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality." *Cultural Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2-3, 2007, pp. 168-178.

Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. *Indian Philosophy*. Oxford University Press, 1923.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. Paradigm Publishers, 2014.

Sarukkai, Sundar. *Indian Philosophy and Philosophy of Science*. Motilal Banarsidass, 2005.

Shiva, Vandana. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development*. Zed Books, 1988.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed Books, 1999.

Vatsyayan, Kapila. *The Square and the Circle of the Indian Arts*. Roli Books, 1983.