CHAPTER-V

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing chapters we have made an enquiry into the problem of God and the Absolute as we get it in various religious and philosophical standpoints with special emphasis on Radhakrishnan’s unique solution to the problem. The present chapter intends to give a concluding remark on the ongoing discussion with emphasis on Radhakrishnan’s reconciliation of God and the Absolute. It is obvious from the analysis of the philosophy of Radhakrishnan that he has lifted God to the standard of the Absolute. While Śaṅkara ascribes phenomenal character to God and Rāmānuja brings the Absolute down to the level of God, Radhakrishnan has uplifted God to the level of the Absolute. This transformation of God into the Absolute has enabled the former to enter into the very being of the world including man thereby qualifying it to be immanent in the world. Thus the characteristics of both immanence and transcendence have been imparted to God by identifying Him with the Absolute. This is why the discovery of the Divine within us has become possible. This is why again two phenomenon, namely, the insight into Ultimate Reality and the discovery of the Divine within us have become the same thing.

Though the other philosophers of the West and the East speak about the Absolute and God in distinctive tone, they have failed to retain a clear distinction between the Absolute of philosophy and God of religion. It is no doubt true that Radhakrishnan is greatly influenced by the philosophers of the East and the West, but his unique contribution is the reconciliation of the Absolute of philosophy and God of religion as aspects of the one Supreme Reality. Radhakrishnan conceived of God and the Absolute not as two disparate entities, but as two distinct aspect of the One Supreme Reality. Unlike Hegel, who identifies God with the Absolute thereby dissatisfying both the theologians and the philosophers, Radhakrishnan
could maintain the essential unity of the Supreme Reality without identifying God with the Absolute. According to Radhakrishnan Absolute and God are not mutually exclusive concepts, nor are they unrelated. The Absolute is the non-relational aspect of the Supreme Being and God is the Absolute in relation. There is no distinction between God and the Absolute. The possible and actual are both contained in the one Reality, Absolute - God. The Absolute is pure being and God is boundless movement. Being is the basis of power. God, the creator, sustainer and judge of the world, does not denote a principle or force separate from the Ultimate. God is regarded as the Absolute from the human end. Both are infinite and divine, exalted above all that is finite and limited. The distinction between them is only logical. The Reality is both formless and formed, indeterminate and determinate. Radhakrishnan maintains, “The Supreme in its non-relational aspect is the Absolute, in its active aspect it is God. The Supreme, limited to its relation to the possibility which is actually accomplishing itself in the world, is the world-spirit.” Radhakrishnan explains that the difference between the Supreme as Spirit and the Supreme as person is one of the standpoint and not of essences. When we consider the abstract and impersonal aspect of the Supreme, we call it the Absolute; we get God when we consider the Supreme as self-aware and self-blissful being. The real is beyond all conceptions of personality and impersonality. We regard it the ‘Absolute’ to express the sense of inadequacy of all our terms and definitions. Again we call it ‘God’ to reveal that it is the basis of all that exists and the goal of all personalities is a symbol. If we ignore its symbolic character, it is likely to shut us from the truth. So according to Radhakrishnan Absolute and God are two different standpoints of the same Reality. Radhakrishnan insisted over and over again that there is no material difference between the Absolute of philosophy and God of religion. Reality is one and the same, although our points of view of looking at it may be many sided.
Radhakrishnan thus resolves the dualism of Philosophy and Religion by saying that there is no difference of value between the Absolute of Philosophy and God of Religion. He has progressively attenuates the difference between the Absolute and God which is the most marked or prominent feature of the Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara. Radhakrishnan returns to the original Vedānta of the Upanishads in his constant endeavour to tell us that the conceptions of God and the Absolute are only the results of looking at the same reality from two complementary points of view. Therefore there is no opposition between them. Whereas we have seen Śaṅkara has introduced the distinction of value between God and the Absolute. Radhakrishnan’s object is just the obliteration of this qualitative difference between them which in turn leads to difference in the spiritual destiny of those who contemplate on the Absolute and those who worship God. Radhakrishnan observes, “Philosophers may quarrel about the Absolute and God, and contend that God, the holy one who is worshipped, in different from the Absolute which is the reality demonstrated by reason. But the religious consciousness has felt that the two are one.” In the Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara the emphasis is more on the Absolute, whereas in the attenuated Advaitism of Radhakrishnan, there is more stress on the concrete character of God. For Śaṅkara, Īśvara or God is a phenomenal appearance of the Absolute which must ultimately pass into it. Radhakrishnan even though subscribing partially to this contention of Śaṅkara, maintains that this is nothing but the return of the Absolute to its own state of self composure. Radhakrishnan wrote, “The Saguna Brahman is not the more self - projection of the yearning or a floating air bubble.” Radhakrishnan vehemently denies that God can be mere appearance of the Absolute. It would be patent from the above discussion of Radhakrishnan’s conception of the problem of God and Absolute that the difference between them is logical and not chronological. In other words he seems to suggest that this is the only way in which we can think of the Ultimate Reality if at all it spiritual in character is the only alternative to the materialistic view of
reality and existence. But the difference of God and the Absolute is not ontological, nor even qualitative, but logical. Radhakrishnan says that the difference between the Absolute and God does not mean that there is a particular point at which the Absolute moves out. The stages are only logical but not chronologically successive. Thus for Radhakrishnan God and the Absolute are not two disparate entities, but that God is the way in which the Absolute appears to and is known by us.

Some charges have been raised by realist scholars against the metaphysics of Radhakrishnan. These criticisms are made from the standpoint of a realist. According to the realist philosophers the Vedāntic Idealism of Radhakrishnan is incapable of giving any lead to our secular democratic set up. How can spiritualism help building up a secular state? These critics assert that Radhakrishnan hardly gives us metaphysics of life a practical philosophy which may serve as the light for men and nations to follow. Again Radhakrishnan asserts that truth is experienced in intuition. Intuition is the knowledge which is obtained when the subject identifies himself with the object. It is said that intuition brings oneness of the subject with the object. But the critics point out that such a metaphysical knowledge by identity is not possible. Knowledge requires duality and not oneness. And as such no knowledge can be obtained by such identity. If intuition is a mode of being then it is an experience. If the subject becomes the object no experience can be possible. Radhakrishnan is regarded to be an idealist philosopher. If the Absolute is real, selves and the world are reduced to nothing. If again if the selves are real, the Absolute does not remain as Absolute.

Some criticisms are raised against Radhakrishnan’s concept of Universal Religion also. Radhakrishnan endeavours to build up a league of religions which would establish a true fellowship of humanity. According to the critics the notion of religion as Radhakrishnan offered is not as universal as he supposes. The philosophy of Radhakrishnan is rooted in the Vedāntic philosophy of Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja. A question arises here; can equality,
fellowship, honesty, morality and brotherhood be cultivated by yogic meditation or mystic experience? The realist philosophers affirm that these virtues cannot be cultivated by meditating on God or Brahman. No purity of character can be obtained by mere abstract spiritual discourses. As Radhakrishnan ignores the fact of perfecting oneself in and through social unity and relationship he does not give any lead to democratic morality.

Let us examine some trenchant criticisms that are drawn against the metaphysics of Radhakrishnan by Charles Hartshorne. Hartshorne was a prominent American Philosopher who concentrated primarily on the philosophy of religion and metaphysics. He developed the neo classical idea of God and produced a modal proof of the existence of God that was a development of St. Anselm’s ontological argument. Hartshorne is also noted for developing Alfred North Whitehead’s process philosophy into process theology. Hartshorne in his article on ‘Radhakrishnan on Mind, Matter and God’ in The Philosophy of Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan edited by P.A. Schilpp raises some critical points against Radhakrishnan’s reconciliation of the problem of God and the Absolute. His criticisms are briefly stated in the following points–

1. Hartshorne is of the opinion that the main problem of Radhakrishnan is to reconcile the Absolute with God. They cannot be simply identified in Radhakrishnan’s philosophy. The Absolute is non relational, transcendent and purely abstract, whereas God is relational, immanent and concrete. To regard the Absolute as without relations is to say that is an absolutely negative existence. Hartshorne raises some questions here - how can there be any reality without relations? If we take out all relations and relative existence from our experience then what remains is bare abstract unity. If God is actual and concrete, how can it be derived from the absolutely abstract Absolute? Criticizing Radhakrishnan Hartshorne states that Radhakrishnan can hardly be explained the manifestation of God, the relative,
concrete and actual power from the non-relational abstract and potential Absolute in a rational manner.

2. Secondly, if God is relative, concrete and actual it is higher than the Absolute. The Absolute denotes a quality or a factor or an adjective of the relative. God can be conceived as containing an absolute factor and added to this, it contains all relations and relative terms. God in his concrete wholeness is relative rather than absolute. Hartshorne wrote, “The Absolute is a factor, an adjective, of the relative, not vice-versa. God is the substantive; the Absolute is a character of this substantive. This inverts Bradley’s doctrine that the relative is a mere appearance of the absolute. On the contrary the absolute is a mere abstract feature of what in its total reality is more than absolute. ‘More than the absolute’, super absolute, may be seen as not really as paradox, if we recall that ‘absolute’ is defined negatively as non-relative.”

Hartshorne affirms that the possibility is less than the actual and concrete and therefore God is more than the Absolute. The Absolute is wanting of concrete existence, relations and actuality whereas God is a concrete whole which contains all these. The whole contains the Absolute also, which is merely the adjective of the substantive, God. According to Hartshorne, “In fact pure possibility abstracted from the actual is really less than the actual.”

This point can be explained by an example of flower. A beautiful flower includes beauty. The white object contains whiteness. In respect to God, all the possibles and potentials are included in His concrete wholeness. The potentiality and possibility is contained in the concrete just as the whiteness which embodies white paper is also there in the white lily. Therefore, God contains the Absolute. God is organic and Absolute is abstract. Hartshorne asserts, God, the concrete organic whole contains the Absolute and is greater than the Absolute.

3. Radhakrishnan regarded the primordial Absolute as eternally complete. The Absolute is the home of all possibilities. God is undergoing change and is evolving in His relations with
universe. But Hartshorne remarks that the Absolute is deficient in actuality. Although it has all the possibilities, yet it has no capacity for concrete realization. All powers of creations are absent in it. Further, it may be argued that a negative abstract, transcendental and non-relational Absolute can hardly be experienced. Hartshorne is of the opinion that in the dynamic and organismic metaphysic of Radhakrishnan the contentless non-substantive Absolute is superfluous.

4. For Radhakrishnan, the Absolute is the pre-cosmic nature of God and God is the Absolute in relation to the cosmos. God recedes in the Absolute when his purposes are fulfilled. When all purposes of God in the world are fulfilled, God and universe merge in the Absolute. But Hartshorne opines that God’s purpose has no end. He asks, “Is not God’s purpose inexhaustible?” If God’s purpose is absolutely infinite in every dimension and respect, how could His possibility ever exhaust?” Radhakrishnan asserts that the concrete is finite; the world being concrete is finite and must cease to exist. But it is like talking about the end of the number of series. In this connection Hartshorne remarks, “I should say that the temporal series has neither beginning nor end, and that ‘pre-cosmic nature of God’ should mean not God before the creaturely process, but God in abstraction from every particular form or world- constellation which this process has actually taken.” Again if the temporal series were finite the world could have beginning and end. But why should it be finite? Radhakrishnan contends that the actuality is finite, since it is only the actuality of a possibility - the latter being infinite in number. But as God is absolutely infinite, in all respects or dimensions, its purposes must be interminable.

But against these criticisms Radhakrishnan responds that the distinction between God and the Absolute as pointed out by Hartshorne is not that of exclusiveness. These principles are not exclusive of each other as Hartshorne has understood. The Absolute is both being and becoming, static and dynamic, reality and power. The supreme in its non-relational aspect is
the Absolute and in its active aspect it is God. According to Radhakrishnan, Hartshorne opines that the concrete and the relative is more than the abstract and the absolute. This view of Hartshorne maintains that the distinction of God and the Absolute is one of separation. But Radhakrishnan contends it is actually not the case. For Radhakrishnan the actual is more than the possible. The abstract possibility and concrete realization are both contained in the one reality which is Absolute - God. The two aspects represent the absolute silence of the Spirit and its boundless movement. Radhakrishnan observes, “The infinite is both amurta, formless and murta, formed. The co-existence of the two is the very nature of Universal Being. It is not a mere juxtaposition of two opposites. The Divine is formless and nameless and yet capable of manifesting all forms and names.”

If we break the Supreme into Absolute, God and Hiranyagarbha in exclusiveness, then only the criticism of Hartshorne can have some relevance. But Radhakrishnan maintains that Absolute, God and Hiranyagarbha are the different aspects of the Reality. These are the simultaneous and not successive poises. The Absolute and God, God and Hiranyagarbha are not distinct realities. It is the misunderstanding of the philosophy of Radhakrishnan that the critics contend that the Absolute is abstract and the world - spirit is more concrete, more full of content than either the Absolute or God. According Radhakrishnan, Reality has three poises and they co-exist simultaneously. The Absolute is inclusive of God and Hiranyagarbha. To say that God is concrete and Absolute is abstract, does not mean that the two are different realities. The Absolute manifests itself as formless and formed, the being and the force, the primordial home of all possibilities and the concrete, actual and the dynamic reality. The distinction as maintained by Radhakrishnan is logical and not actual or temporal. Radhakrishnan asserts, “The Supreme has three simultaneous poises of being, the transcendent Absolute, Brahman, the creative freedom, Īśvara and the wisdom, power and love manifest in this world, Hiranyagarbha. These do not succeed each other in time. It is an
order of arrangement and logical priority and not of temporal succession.” Radhakrishnan further contends that the tendency to regard Īśvara or God as phenomenal and Brahman or the Absolute as real is not correct. This is a distinction of great significance which we should preserve, if we are to have a balanced view of the Supreme.

Further, Hartshorne criticizing Radhakrishnan maintains that God’s purposes are inexhaustible, the world is eternal and the possibility may never be actualized. The world may be eternal and ceaseless, and there is hardly any necessity for God and the world coming to a close. Radhakrishnan replied that the possibilities are inexhaustible, but one specific possibility cannot be inexhaustible. Moreover, if the divine purpose with regard to this world be ceaseless or eternal, all our efforts for realization would be meaningless. All our endeavours would be meaningless if the world remains ever incomplete and imperfect and if no amount of our pursuit can lead us to the final perfection or goal. Radhakrishnan replying to his critics states, “I agree that the possibilities are inexhaustible, but not that any one specific possibility is inexhaustible. If we are not certain that the divine purpose with regard to this world will be realized, the cosmic process will turn out to be unending pursuit of a goal which will forever remain unaccomplished. There must be the assurance of the eventual triumph of this possibility, of the realization of the ideal. Apart from this, life and effort would be meaningful.”

In spite of these critical comments Radhakrishnan’s solution to the problem of the relation between God and the Absolute is unique in the field of philosophy and more impressive than the solutions offered by others. The main contribution of Radhakrishnan consists in the reconciliation of the Absolute with God. The Absolute is consciousness, truth and bliss. Radhakrishnan emphasizes Śaṅkara’s view of Brahman as a transcendental, indeterminate and formless being. But for Radhakrishnan, Brahman is consciousness as well as force also. The Absolute is full of contents and powers and as such it is not a vacuum. It
has infinite powers and it can manifest different gods or powers and different worlds which form its contents. Therefore, the Absolute is not a content less vacuum; it is a differentiated unity in which the different powers and realities are united in one existence. Radhakrishnan accepts Śaṅkara’s view with a difference. For Śaṅkara, the Absolute is devoid of contents whereas for Radhakrishnan it has contents and powers which are real.

The philosophy of Radhakrishnan is thoroughly spiritual. The Absolute is not an intellectual concept nor it is human consciousness. The Absolute is spiritual and its activity and manifestation are not fully known to the intellect. The Absolute does not manifest in a triadic manner and as such it does not follow the limited path of thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis. The Absolute works in many directions. Radhakrishnan in his philosophy, very clearly maintained the relation between Absolute and God, and God and the world. The Absolute has only limited projection in God. Radhakrishnan has theistic view and in this sense comes very close to Rāmānuja. God is neither unreal, nor has He false or illusory powers. God is the creator of the world and dispenser of justice. From the religious standpoint, God fulfils all our demands though He exists only till the world lasts. After the dissolution of the world, God recedes in the Absolute.

Throughout his exposition of his metaphysical position Radhakrishnan repeatedly emphasizes on the theme that the Real is One. Among other things science has also taught us that the universe in which we live, move and have our being is organic in nature, every part of the universe is interlinked with every other part. Human beings are not isolated, insular units, but are, in a true sense, organic to the world. That is why Radhakrishnan insists that every unit of nature is a microcosm reflecting in itself the entire, all inclusive macrocosm. Śaṅkara’s doctrine of Māyā is often criticized on the ground that it reduces the world to illusion and nothingness and also undermines the entire fabric of ethical world. Radhakrishnan points out that although the Absolute is the only ultimate and complete reality
and that the reality of the empirical world is secondary, dependent and relative, yet the empirical world is not unreal. It is because changes in the finite empirical world do not affect the Absolute Infinite Reality. The world has only relative reality and the relationship between the Absolute and the empirical world is an ultimate mystery. Truly speaking, the empirical world is neither real nor unreal. Radhakrishnan repudiates the conventional view that the universe is an illusion. He maintains that the empirical universe is indeed being, though of a lower order.

The most important and significant contribution of Radhakrishnan is in the field of religion. For Radhakrishnan, religion consists in doing justice in loving mercy and in making our fellow creatures happy. Religion is an integral element of human nature, an intimation of destiny, a perception of the values of the individual and an awareness of the importance of human choice for the future of the world. Religion is not something external to human life nor a system of sanctions and consolations. That is why Radhakrishnan insists that spirituality is the core of religion. Radhakrishnan repeatedly speaks of spiritual experience as a mode of integral insight. The Supreme is not an object but the absolute subject which cannot be apprehended either by sense perception or logical inference. Radhakrishnan contends that the so called conflicts of religion can be resolved once we become aware of the stand points from which religious statements have been made. Radhakrishnan therefore insists on fellowship of religions instead of fusion of religions. Radhakrishnan succeeded in assimilating the essential ideas of the religions of the East and the West. His lifelong task was therefore to set himself the stupendous work of understanding and synthesizing on a philosophical level whatever is of lasting value in different religions of the world.

Radhakrishnan is essentially a philosopher with a deeply religious and spiritual bent of mind. All his social and political thinking is thoroughly imbued with spiritualistic outlook. In laying the foundation of his political thought, Radhakrishnan has emphasized spirit,
intuition and religion. But unlike many Hegelians and Indian idealists he conceives the spirit not as a substance, but as life. The spirit in man is also the reality underlying all existence. Radhakrishnan advocates internationalism so as to build a world community where all nations work together for the survival of human race. The Vedānta philosophy upholds that the entire universe is sustained by one universal spirit and Radhakrishnan sincerely believes that this faith is at the root of international understanding and harmony. When he says that religion is the basis of international peace and harmony he does not use the word ‘religion’ in the conventional sense of the term. But he urges that our historical religions will have to transform themselves into the universal faith. Radhakrishnan holds that the people of the world are working for religion which teaches the possibility and necessity of man’s union with himself, with nature, with his fellowmen and with a Eternal Spirit of which the visible universe is but a manifestation and upholds the emergence of a complete consciousness as the destiny of man.

It is interesting to mention here that Fritjof Capra, an eminent exponent of the modern physics, also arrives at almost the same conclusion from a physicist point of view. Capra, states that deep ecology is supported by modern science and in particular by the new systems approach, but actually, it is rooted in a perception of reality that goes beyond the scientific frame work to an intuitive awareness of the oneness of all life the interdependence of its multiple manifestations and its cycles of change and transformation. When the concept of human spirit is understood in this sense, as the mode of consciousness in which the individual is connected to the cosmos as a whole, it becomes clear that ecological awareness is truly spiritual. Capra emphatically stated that there is a parallelism between ‘New Physics’ and Eastern Mysticism. The word ‘New Physics’ means Quantum mechanics, which began with Max Planck’s theory of quanta in 1900, and relativity theory, which began with Albert Einstein’s special theory of relativity in 1905. The old physics is the physics of Isaac
Newton, which he discovered about three hundred years ago. ‘Classical physics’ means any physics that attempts to explain reality in such a manner that for every element of physical reality there is a corresponding element in the theory. Therefore, ‘Classical physics’ includes the physics of Isaac Newton and relativity, both of which are structured in this one–to–one manner. It does not however include quantum mechanics, which is one of the things that make quantum mechanics unique. Classical physics is usually concerned with everyday condition: speeds much lower than the speed of light and sizes much greater than that of atoms. Modern physics is usually concerned with high velocities and small distances.

In almost all the spheres of human society modern physics has had a profound influence. The influence of modern physics goes beyond technology as it extends to the realm of thought and culture where it has led to a deep revision in our conception of the universe and of our relation to it. With the exploration of the atomic and subatomic world in the twentieth century, modern physics has developed many of our basic concepts. The treatment of matter in sub-atomic physics, concept of space, time, cause and effect, etc are totally different from its treatment as found in classical physics. With the transformation of these fundamental concepts our observance towards the whole world has begun to change. But these developed views that are brought by modern physics has a striking similarity between the world views held in Eastern mysticism. The concepts of modern physics often show surprising parallels to the ideas expressed in the religious philosophies of the Far East.11

The most important characteristic of Eastern world is the awareness of the unity and mutual interrelation of all things and events, the experience of all phenomena in the world as manifestations of a basic oneness. All things of the universe are regarded as interdependent and inseparable parts of this cosmic whole, as different manifestations of the same ultimate reality. In the Eastern traditions we find the constant emphasis upon this ultimate indivisible
reality which manifests itself in all things and of which all things are parts of it. This ultimate reality has various names, as in Hinduism it is regarded as Brahma, Dharmakāya or tathastā in Buddhism, Tao in Taoism. As ordinary human being we are not aware of this unity of all things and divide the world into separate objects and events. This division is of course necessary in order to adjust with our everyday environment, but it is not a fundamental feature of reality. It is an abstraction devised by our discriminating and categorizing intellect. It is due to avidyā or ignorance we believe that our abstract concepts of separate ‘things’ and ‘events’ are realities of nature. Therefore the Eastern mystics are mainly concerned with readjusting the mind by centering and quietening it through meditation. Meditation or Samādhi, literally means ‘mental equilibrium’ refers to the balanced and tranquil state of mind in which the basic unity of the universe is experienced. It is quite interesting to mention here that the basic oneness of the universe is not only the central characteristic of mystical experience, but is also one of the most important revelations of modern physics. This oneness of the universe is apparent at the atomic level and manifests itself more and more as one penetrates deeper into matter, down into the realm of subatomic particles. The study of the various models of subatomic particles reveal that the constituents of matter and the basic phenomena involving them are all interconnected, interrelated and interdependent. These entities are regarded as the integrated parts of the whole and they cannot be treated as isolated entities. In quantum theory or the theory of atomic phenomena, this interconnectedness of nature is emphasized.

Human mind is capable of apprehending two kinds of knowledge or two modes of consciousness namely rational and intuitive. These modes of consciousness are traditionally associated with science and religion respectively. Rational knowledge is derived from the experience we have with objects and events in our everyday environment. Rational knowledge belongs to the realm of the intellect whose function is to discriminate, divide,
compare, measure and categorize. Of course the realm of rational knowledge is the realm of science which measures and quantifies, classifies and analyses. But in modern physics the limitations of such kind of knowledge is very prominent. In the words of Werner Heisenberg, “that every word or concept clear as it may seem to be, has only a limited range of applicability.”

Eastern mystics are concerned with direct experience of reality which transcends intellectual thinking as well as sensory perception. Knowledge obtained from this type of experience is regarded by the Buddhists as ‘absolute knowledge’, as it does not rely on the discriminations, abstractions and classifications of the intellect which are always relative and approximate. Complete apprehension of this experience is the central characteristic of all mystical experience. Eastern mystics emphasized the point that the ultimate reality is such that it can never be an object of reasoning or of demonstrable knowledge. It can never be adequately described by words, because it lies beyond the realms of the senses and of the intellect from which our words and concepts are derived. Thus the absolute knowledge is an entirely non-intellectual experience of reality.

Physicists are mainly concerned with rational knowledge whereas the mystics are with intuitive knowledge. But still both these types of knowledge occur in both fields. In fact rational part of research would be useless if it were not complemented by intuition that gives scientists new insights and makes them creative. As there is an intuitive element in science, there is also a rational element in Eastern mysticism. Some school of Eastern mysticism emphasized reason and logic highly whereas in case of some other schools the emphasis of reason is less. For example, the Hindu Vedānta or the Buddhist Mādhyamika are highly intellectual schools, whereas Taoists have always had a deep mistrust of reason and logic. Zen which grew out of Buddhism, but was strongly influenced by Taoism, prides itself on being ‘without words, without explanations, without instructions, without knowledge.’ The direct mystical experience is the core of all schools of Eastern mysticism. Even these mystics
who are engaged in the most sophisticated argumentation never see the intellect as their source of knowledge. But use it merely to analyze and interpret their personal mystical experience.

In the early years of the twentieth century Max Planck, Albert Einstein, Louis de Broglie, Neils Bohr, Werner Heisenberg, Erwin Schrödinger, Max Born, Paul Dirac and others created the theory now known as quantum mechanics. This theory was not developed in a strictly logical way. Rather it was developed by a series of guesses inspired by profound physical insight and a thorough command of new mathematical methods was taken together to create a theoretical edifice, whose predictive power is such that quantum mechanics is considered as the most successful theoretical physics construct of human mind. Quantum theory is the theoretical basis of modern physics that explains the nature and behaviour of matter and energy on the atomic and subatomic level. A ‘quantum’ is a quantity of something, a specific amount. ‘Mechanics’ is the study of motion. Therefore, ‘quantum mechanics’ is the study of the motion of quantities. Quantum theory says that nature comes in bits and pieces (quanta), and quantum mechanics is the study of this phenomenon. Quantum mechanics does not replace Newtonian physics, it includes it. The physics of Newton remains valid in its limits. Quantum mechanics resulted from the study of the subatomic realm, that invisible universe underlying, embedded in and forming the fabric of everything around us.

Quantum physics is the study of how, what and why everything that makes up the universe as well as everything in it, both the seen as well as the unseen, is derived. It is a detailed study of what is known as Quantum Mechanics which determines how everything in the cosmos has come to exist beginning at the atomic and sub-atomic of levels. More simply, it is a depth study of the building blocks of the universe. Everything that we see in the physical world is made up of molecules. Quantum physics goes a few steps beyond
molecules have taken these tiny little wonders and broken them down even further and
developed the ability to study the various things that make them up, which are known as sub-
atomic particles. The next step down from a molecule is an atom. The next steps down from
an atom are subatomic particles, which consist of photons, leptons, electrons, neutrons,
quarks, etc.

In 1900, physicist Max Planck presented his quantum theory to the German physical
Society. Planck had sought to discover the reason that radiation from a glowing body
changes in colour from red, to orange and finally to blue as its temperature rises. He found
that by making the assumption that energy existed in individual units in the same way that
matter does, rather than just as a constant electromagnetic wave as has been formerly
assumed and was therefore quantifiable. The existence of these units became the first
assumption of quantum theory. Planck made the assumption that energy was made of
individual units or quanta. In 1905, Albert Einstein theorized that not just the energy, but the
radiation itself was quantized in the same manner. He boldly emphasized that light and every
other form of electromagnetic radiation can appear not only as electromagnetic waves, but
also in the form of these quanta. In 1924, Louis de Broglie proposed that there is no
fundamental difference in the makeup and behaviour of energy and matter; on the atomic and
sub-atomic level either may behave as if made of either particles or waves. This theory
became known as the principle of wave-particle duality. Elementary particles of both
energy and matter behave, depending on the conditions, like either particles or waves. In
1927, Werner Heisenberg proposed that precise, simultaneous measurement of two
complementary values—such as the position and momentum of a subatomic particle—is
impossible. Contrary to the principles of classical physics, their simultaneous measurement is
inescapably flawed; the more precisely one value is measured, the more flawed will be the
measurement of the other value.
The Copenhagen interpretation was the first consistent attempt to understand the world of atoms as this is represented by quantum mechanics. It is a collection of axioms or doctrines that interpret the mathematical formalism of quantum mechanics, largely devised in the years 1925-1927 by Neils Bohr and Werner Heisenberg. Neils Bohr proposed the Copenhagen Interpretation of quantum theory, which asserts that a particle is whatever it is measured to be, but that it cannot be assumed to have specific properties, or even to exist, until it is measured. In short Bohr was saying that object reality does not exist. This translates to a principle called super imposition that claims that while we do not know what the state of any object is, it is actually in all possible states simultaneously, as long as we do not look to check. The Copenhagen interpretation says, in effect, that it does not matter what quantum mechanics is about. The important thing is that it works in all possible experimental situations. Classical physics draws a distinction between particles and waves. It also relies on continuity and on determinism in natural phenomena. In the early twentieth century, newly discovered atomic and sub-atomic phenomena seemed to defy those conceptions. In 1925-1926, quantum mechanics was invented as a formalism that accurately describes the experiments without solely relying on these classical concepts. Instead of that, it relies on probability as metaphysically intrinsic in nature, natural discontinuity and on causality. The Copenhagen interpretation intends to indicate the proper ways of thinking and speaking about the physical meaning of mathematical formulations of quantum mechanics. If offers due respect to discontinuity, probability and a conception of wave particle dualism. The extraordinary importance of the Copenhagen Interpretation lies in the fact that for the first time, scientists attempting to formulate a consistent physics were forced by their own findings to acknowledge that a complete understanding of reality lies beyond the capabilities of rational thought.
At the atomic level, matter has a dual aspect; it appears as particles and as waves. The particle aspect is dominant in some situations whereas in some other situations particles behave more like waves. This dual nature is also exhibited by light and all other electromagnetic radiation. The wave particle duality principle of quantum physics holds that matter and light exhibit the behaviours of both waves and particles, depending upon the circumstances of experiment. Neils Bohr regarded the ‘wave particle duality paradox’ as a fundamental or metaphysical fact of nature. Sometimes the wave aspect was apparent and sometimes the particle aspect with the same kind of quantity entity, but in respectively different physical settings. He saw it as one aspect of the concept of complementarity. Werner Heisenberg considered the question further. He saw the duality as present for all quantic entities, but not in the same manner as considered by Bohr. He saw it in what is called second quantization, which generates an entirely new concept of fields which exist in ordinary space-time, causality still being visualizable. The wave particle duality was the end of the line for classical causality. This duality prompted the first real step in understanding the newly unfolding quantum theory.

The major significance of wave-particle duality is that all behaviours of light and matter can be explained through the use of a differential equation which represents a wave function, generally in the form of the Schrödinger equation. This ability to describe reality in the form of waves is at the heart of quantum mechanics. The most common interpretation is that the wave function represents the probability of finding a given particle at a given point. These probability equations can diffract, interface and exhibit other wave-like properties, resulting in a final probabilistic wave function that exhibits these properties as well. The probability of a particle being in any location is a wave, but the actual physical appearance of that particle is not. In quantum mechanics we discover that the entire universe is actually a series of probabilities. It breaks down when dealing with large objects, as demonstrated by
Schrödinger’s cat through experiment. Schrödinger expressed his position by proposing that a hypothetical cat can be placed in a hypothetical box. At this stage there is no question that the cat is alive. In the box with the cat we would place a vial of poison gas, which will instantly, kill the cat. The vial is hooked up to an apparatus which is wired into a Geiger counter, a device used to detect radiation. The radioactive atom is placed near the Geiger counter and left there for exactly one hour. If the atom decays, then the Geiger counter will detect the radiation, break the vial and kill the cat. If the atom does not decay, then the vial will be intact and cat will be alive. After the one hour period, the atom is in a state where it is both decayed and not decayed. However it depends on, how we have constructed the situation. This means that the vial is both broken and not broken and ultimately according to the Copenhagen Interpretation of quantum physics the cat is both dead and alive.

The concept of complementarity was developed by Neils Bohr to explain the wave particle duality of light. Here is a favourite statement of Bohr’s principle of complementarity based on so- called wave particle duality for light: “But what is light really: Is it a wave or a shower of photons? There seems no likelihood for forming a consistent description of the phenomena of light by choice of only one of the two languages. It seems as though we must use sometimes the one theory and sometimes the other, while at times we may use either. We are faced with a new kind of difficulty. We have two contradictory pictures of reality; separately neither of them fully explains the phenomena of light, but together they do.”

According to this theory wave and particle are mutually exclusive or complementary aspects of light. Although one of them always excludes the other, both of them are necessary to understand light. One of them always excludes the other because light or anything else cannot be both wave like and particle like at the same time.

The uncertainty principle is one of the most famous ideas in physics. It tells us that there is fuzziness in nature, a fundamental limit to what we can know about the behaviour of
quantum particle and therefore the smallest scales of nature of these scales, the most we can hope for is to calculate probabilities for where things are and how they will behave. Werner Heisenberg’s simple idea tells us why atoms do not implode. Heisenberg was working through the implications of quantum theory; a new way of explaining how atoms behaved that had been developed by physicists including Neils Bohr, Paul Dirac and Erwin Schrödinger. Among its many counter intuitive ideas, quantum theory proposed that energy was not continuous but instead came in discrete packets (quanta) and the light could be described as both a wave and a stream of these quanta. In fleshing out this radical world view Heisenberg discovered a problem in the way that the basic physical properties of a particle in a quantum system could be measured. Heisenberg asserts that we can never know what actually goes on in the invisible subatomic realm and therefore we should “abandon all attempts to construct perceptual models of atomic processes.” According this theory, we can legitimately work with what we observe directly. The uncertainty principle says that we cannot measure the position and the momentum of a particle with absolute precision. The more accurately we know one of these values, the less accurately we know the other. One way to think about the uncertainty principle is an extension of how we see and measure things in the everyday world.

Heisenberg’s important discovery was that there are limits beyond which we cannot measure accurately, at the same time the processes of nature. These limits are not due to the in authentic nature of our measuring devices or extremely small size of the entities that we attempt to measure. But it is due to the very way that nature presents itself to us. In other words there exists an ambiguity barrier beyond which we never can pass without venturing into the realm of uncertainty. That is why Heisenberg’s theory is known as the ‘uncertainty principle.’ The uncertainty principle observes that as we penetrate deeper and deeper into subatomic realm, we reach a certain point at which one part or another of our picture of
nature becomes blurred and there is no way to re clarify that part without blurring another part of the picture. It is like adjusting a moving picture that is slightly out of focus. When we make final adjustment of a moving picture we surprised to discover that when the right side of the picture clears, the left side of the picture becomes completely unfocused and nothing in it is recognizable. Again, if we try to focus the left side of the picture, the right side starts to blur and soon the situation is reversed. If we try to strike a balance between these two extremes, both sides of the picture return to a recognizable condition, we cannot remove the original fuzziness from them. According to the uncertainty principle, the right side of the picture corresponds to the position in space of a moving particle, where the left side of the picture corresponds to its momentum. Therefore, if follows from the uncertainty principle that we cannot measure accurately, both the position and the momentum of a moving particle at the same time. If we precisely determine the momentum of the particle, there is no way to determine its position.

From the perspective of quantum theory, the classical deterministic laws of nature have been dismantled. In contrast to the classical view of solid material objects quantum theory interprets phenomena as wave like patterns of probabilities. The probabilities are not of ‘things’, but rather probabilities of interconnections. Subatomic particles have no existence as concrete, isolated entities. Phenomenal reality can only be understood in terms of the probability of interconnections. Quantum theory thus reveals an essential unity of the universe. The world cannot be deconstructed into independently isolated ‘building blocks.’ Rather a dynamic interplay exists between the various parts of the whole. These relations also include ‘the observer.’ The human observer becomes the final link in the chain of observational process, since an essential interconnection exist in all phenomena. Quantum theory compels us to see the universe not as a collection of physical objects, but rather as a complicated web of relations between the various parts of a unified whole. However, the
Eastern mystics have experienced the world in the same way as the modern physicists had and some of them have expressed their experience in words which are almost identical with those used by atomic physicists.

The Eastern mystics have a dynamic view of the universe similar to that of modern physics. The parallels of Eastern Mysticism and modern physics become particularly striking when sound is considered as a wave with a certain frequency which changes with the sound. Particles are also waves with frequencies proportional to their energies. According to modern physics, each particle perpetually sings its song and produces a rhythmic ‘dancer of energy in dense and subtle forms. Modern physicists use phrases like the ‘dance of creation and destruction’ and ‘energy dance’. The conception of rhythm and dance emerge naturally when one tries to imagine the discharge of energies going through the patterns that make up particle world. Modern Physics and Eastern Mysticism, therefore demonstrate that rhythm and motion are essential aspects of the phenomenal universe. Another parallel is the understanding that all matter, whether here on Earth or in the outer space, is participating in a continual cosmic dance. Moreover, both of them agree on the idea of the emergent and convergent universe. According to Eastern mysticism, the world of Māyā (illusion) changes perpetually, since the cosmic dance of Shiva is a rhythmic, dynamic dance. In the active principle of the cosmic dance, the entire universe is the action, manifest and emerging, while in its non-active principle the entire universe has converged into an unmanifest essence. Modern physics works in a very different framework and cannot go that far in the experience of the unity of all things. But it has made a great step towards the world view of the Eastern mystics in atomic theory. Quantum theory has abolished the notion of fundamentally separated objects. It has introduced the concept of the participator to replace that of the observer. It has made the universe as an interconnected web of physical and mental relations where parts are only defined through their connections to the whole.
In spite of their different approaches, there exists parallelism between the views of modern physicists and mystics. The physicists derive their method from experiments whereas the mystics from meditative insights. Both are observations and in both these fields observations are acknowledged as the only source of knowledge. Of course the object of observation is very different in two cases. The mystic looks within and explores his or her consciousness at its various levels, which include the body as the physical manifestation of the mind. But the physicists in contrast to the mystics, begins his enquiry into the essential nature of things by studying the material world. By penetrating more deeper realms of matter, the physicists became aware of the fact that he himself and his consciousness are an integral part of this unity. In this say the mystics and the physicists arrive at the same conclusion; one starting from the inner realm and the other from the outer world. The harmony between their views confirms the ancient Indian wisdom that Brahman, the Ultimate Reality without, is identical to Atman, the Reality within.\(^\text{15}\) Although initially the ways of modern physics and Eastern mystics seem to be totally unrelated, yet they have much in common. The modern physicists experiences the world through an extreme specialization of the rational mind whereas the mystic through an extreme specialization of the intuitive mind. Although two approaches are entirely different, yet they are to be regarded as complementary to each other. Neither is comprehended in the other nor can either of them be reduced to the other, but both of them are necessary, supplementing one another for a fuller understanding of the world.\(^\text{16}\) Therefore what we need is not a synthesis, but a dynamic interplay between mystical intuition and scientific analysis.

In the same way the philosophy of Radhakrishnan has a universal outlook. He suggests that if the people of the world are to survive, the survival cannot be secured by means of any political, scientific or technological achievement, in their exclusive aspects, but it can only be secured by a world-wide community based upon tolerance, which is based
upon a mutual understanding of the different people’s cultural heritage. Like Swami Vivekananda, Tagore, Gandhi and Aurobindo- Radhakrishnan suggests a unity of mankind, in spite of diversity. The final philosophical search of his philosophy is a realization of a non-dual Absolute Reality. It is an effort to raise mankind morally, regardless of their various religions, racial and national differences, thus striving for world – wide peace through mutual understanding and tolerance, in a truly Vedic spirit of universality. Radhakrishnan exhibits an idea of philosophy that is closely related with religion. He is basically concerned with Religion of the Spirit, which is a plea for unity of all religions, finding its absence in the religio-socio-political world of today. Radhakrishnan’s ideal of all existing religions of the world, is the Religion of the Spirit, which is an interreligious process beyond all religions to a process of progressive unity and apprehension or fellowship behind all religious consciousness. Radhakrishnan has stressed the importance of spiritual religion and has revealed its contents in an acceptable manner, by an interpretation of science and reason in their advanced aspects. Radhakrishnan speaks for the unity of faiths. In his study of the writings of the Mystics of different faiths he finds some agreements, but he does not restrict himself to them, without looking backwards and forwards in this process to improve upon their adventures. All experiences from mysticism to the sciences- have to be viewed in their interconnectedness and prospects beyond them, through prospective insightful experiences. It appears that the philosophy of Radhakrishnan is mysticism so far as the concept of spirit is concerned. He has regarded the spirit as total Brahman. Brahman precedes creation. Identifying God with creator, Radhakrishnan said that they are the different forms of seeing the same ultimate reality. Radhakrishnan believes the world to be the expression of God.

Radhakrishnan interprets the world as the play and evolution of spirit. Matter, life, and mind are the manifestation of spirit in the world. Spirit is not a substance, but life itself. The self, God and Absolute are all names of the one universal spirit in different aspects. Thus
the most characteristic feature of the spirit is its integrality. He from an advanced inter-
religious perspective declares that religion is the Religion of the Spirit and suggests a
developing religious process which is suitable for whole mankind. For Radhakrishnan non-
being is a limiting and finitising process. He identifies the Being- itself with the Brahman of
the Upanishads and from a comparative East-West perspective he gives it the name of the
Absolute. He considers the Absolute as an abode of possibilities and God and the World,
together as one of the possibilities. God provides a ground for the confronted world-situation,
so that man can be operative, as a process in conformity with God’s shaping of the world –
process towards transcendental possibility. After the function of the planning of the World is
over, both God and World (including human beings) lapse into the Absolute, so that no
residues are left. Therefore, a ground is prepared for a fresh possibility by a lapse of the
completed process in to the abode of the Absolute. Hence in Radhakrishnan’s philosophy
religious consciousness of God and the World is a dependent notion. His is supremacy of the
Absolute, not a static Absolute, but a creative possibility. The pre-cosmic nature of God is
identical with the Absolute and the post cosmic God, will lapse into the background of the
Absolute. This position of Radhakrishnan is not an argument, but an immediate intuitional
experience- a meditative process and possibility. Radhakrishnan’s main concern was to
indicate the philosophical process in development from a transcendental – intuitional basis,
confronting a universe, where God is functioning as a planner of the unformed World, and
where each individual man, fulfilling this God’s purpose, has to play a unique role to elevate
human society in a progressive spiritual direction.

The dominant theme in the metaphysics of Radhakrishnan is the presence of one
universal spirit as the inner essence of all being and becoming. The notion of spirit as the
Ultimate Reality is not an original idea of Radhakrishnan, as there is already the reference of
the spirit as Reality in the Upanishads and the works of all idealist thinkers in the world. But
Radhakrishnan has made an original contribution by connecting the idea of spirit with the findings of modern science. The greatest merit of his philosophy is that it is an interpretation of the real world and real life. He does not confine philosophy to realization of truth like the ancient Indian seers, but applies it to actual problems of life. Therefore all his ideas revolve around science, intuition and religion. He does not accept dialectical materialism or any materialism for that matter. He is mystic so far as the reply to the ultimate why is concerned. He asserts that spirit is the basis and background of all reality, universal substance which cannot be explained by this or that formula. The three elements of metaphysics – the self, the God and the world- are the different expressions of one universal spirit. This universal spirit has been variously called God and the Absolute, Īśvara and Brahman. Spirit is the Absolute. In creative universal expression it is God. God is the expression of Absolute spirit in the world. Absolute and God, formless and formed, abstract and concrete may be only theoretically distinguished. In Reality these are identical. Thus Radhakrishnan in his integral philosophy has worked out a synthesis of rationalism, theism, pantheism, mysticism and idealism, all enjoying their respective places. It is a philosophy of harmony and accommodation, of essential concord and homogeneity, where all have an assurance of the present and hope for the future.
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