CHAPTER - VII
CONCLUSION
One of the most fundamental problems of philosophy is the discrimination of the basic methods of inquiry into the nature of the ultimate reality. All the methods adopted so far may be brought under two main headings - (1) intellectual and (2) intuitional. For the advocates of the former method, thought of intellect is the highest kind of way of knowing, while for the advocates of the latter method, intuition is the highest kind of way of knowing. For the intuitionists, intellect gives only a superficial view of the reality. They point out the limitations of empirical, rational and critical methods in philosophy and accept their relative value. They regard intuition as the only method to delve deep into the recesses of Reality.

Among these philosophers, Bradley is one who supports 'intuition' or 'immediate experience' as the way of knowing Reality. While Hegel asserts that thought is identical with reality, Bradley maintains an essential distinction between thought and reality. Reality, from Bradley's point of view is not accessible to thought, because thought cannot get over the dualism of 'that' and 'what’, existence and content. Thought sets before itself the ideal of an all inclusive harmonious system but the very nature of thought is such that it
can never realise that ideal. In order that thought may attain its true end, it must develop into a form of immediate experience. This higher immediate experience in which thought is to be absorbed must possess the coherence of thought and at the same time the directness of immediate experience in a superior form. Thought therefore recognises that only by committing 'suicide', i.e., by transcending its relational form it can grasp the immediate whole of reality. Dissatisfied with its own operations which are riddled with contradictions, thought, according to Bradley, points to its absorption, not annihilation, in a higher and fuller immediate experience or intuition.

Bradley's 'intuition' or 'immediate experience' is the triplicate fullness of thinking, feeling and willing in their transmuted forms. Immediate experience is pre-relational unbroken unity of feeling which is given in all experience. In immediate experience there is no distinction between my awareness and that of which it is aware. Her immediate feeling, knowing and being are in one, with which knowledge begins. Bradley also speaks of higher supra-intellectual immediate experience in which our finite thought is ultimately absorbed. The distinction between lower immediacy and higher immediacy is a significant contribution of Bradley to the intuitionist philosophy. He has characterised the two essentials of reality as existence and content, 'that' and 'what'. The 'that' is the existential aspect and 'what' the meaning or values aspect of reality. The full comprehension of both these aspects means the comprehension of reality. In feeling or lower immediacy
there is the presence of both but is a most inchoate form. In thought there is splitting of the two, and consequently, no adequate comprehension of reality. It is only in higher immediacy or intuition, which supervenes upon thought, that there is perfect union of the 'that' and 'what', and consequently, a full comprehension of reality.

Bergson, the intuitionist philosopher, states that reality is a living being. It is a constant flow. This constant flow is called by Bergson duration. Duration is nothing but elan-vital. The reality which is continuously changing cannot be apprehended by intelligence. Bergson maintains that knowledge acquired by intelligence is relative and limited knowledge. Intellectual knowledge is fragmentary. The knowledge of life and spirit cannot be brought within the grasp of intelligence. The intellectualist or scientific view of reality takes away from it all movement and life. Hence Bergson is opposed to it.

In contrast to the Bergsonian antagonism between intellect and intuition, and true to the spirit of the Upaniṣadic philosophy, Radhakrishnan maintains that intellect is not opposed to intuition. Intuitional knowledge is not irrational knowledge, but supra-rational. Scriptural truths are religious and spiritual truths; they can be grasped by intuition, which is above intellect. This new teaching of the relation between intellect and intuition has strengthened the spiritual tradition of philosophy in India by synthesizing the idealist traditions of both the East and the West into the metaphysics of integral experience.
For Radhakrishnan, philosophy is a vision of all that is real, a dars'an, "the vision of truth and not a matter of logical argument and proof." Radhakrishnan distinguishes between philosophy as merely a matter of logical proof and philosophy based on intuitive experience. It is the latter that is a higher form of knowledge, since, unlike the former it assures a direct apprehension of reality and so ensures truth and wisdom. Intuition as the highest form of knowledge has been accepted by the Upaniṣads, the Buddha, Śaṅkara and also by Plato, Bergson and Bradley. It is in fact the source of all scientific and artistic creativity and the foundation of all higher metaphysical truths.

Radhakrishnan does not condemn intellect unlike Bradley and Bergson. For him both intellect and intuition are justified in their respective ways and modes. Discursive intellect is overcome in intuition. But Radhakrishnan does not condemn the intellect. He says that intuition lies beyond intellect, but it is not contrary to the intellect. There is no contrast between intellect and intuition and for Radhakrishnan the intellectual way of knowing is actually preparation for the intuitive way of knowing. Radhakrishnan's view is in agreement with the view of them in certain aspects. It appears that he has succeeded in overcoming the limitations of Bradley and Bergson. Like Śaṅkara, Radhakrishnan regards intuition to be samyagjñāna. Bergson holds that
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through intuition man can apprehend the very movement of life and can be freed from the contradictions of intelligence. Though intellect and intuition are complementary, yet Bergson condemns intellect. For him "Intuition" means "a kind of intellectual sympathy by which one places oneself within an object in order to coincide with what is unique in it and consequently inexpressible."  

Radhakrishnan is one of the most celebrated exponents of Indian idealism and interpreter of Indian philosophy. His contribution lies in making the Indian heritage accessible to the west. He puts forward the idealistic metaphysics which the sages and thinkers of India had evolved long years ago. His outlook of the universal spirit aims at the spiritual unity of mankind as an imperative need of present age.

Radhakrishnan develops comparative thinking on the basis of his integral experience. He confirms that his philosophy can be called integral experience which consists of three elements --- absolute idealism, intuitionism and mysticism combined with vedānta. The integral experience may even be called reinterpretation of the vedāntic method. Radhakrishnan feels the need of reinterpretation of Indian philosophy in the light of our present conditions.

"The vision of the philosopher", says Radhakrishnan, "is the reaction
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of his whole personality to the nature of the experienced world." The holistic vision is the total experience and the creative synthesis of all knowledge. Intuition, according to Radhakrishnan, provides direct access to reality. Intellect is not the direct apprehension of the Absolute and so falls short of the absolute truth insofar as its claims remain subordinate to the claims of intuition. Intuition is fact-stating rather than interpretative and so reveals truth as it is. It is based on integral experience, that is, the totality of man's available experience. Intellectual knowledge is fragmentary. Radhakrishnan holds that in view of the availability of an integral experience, it is too facile to claim finality about intellectual knowledge, howsoever scientific and rational it may appear to be. If intuition is rooted in the spiritual nature of man and there are evidences that the spirit of man is more real than his body or intellect, the argument that the total experience of reality is far greater in truth than a fragment of it is irrefutable.

Radhakrishnan tries to establish integral experience as the way to attain self knowledge of ultimate reality. Different forms of intuition such as the sensuous, the rational and the supersensuous are combined together into a single one, which is termed by him "integral experience". "Integral experience" of Radhakrishnan is an adequate and energetic answer to the sceptical philosophies that deny the power of man to know the reality. It is
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impossible to know the supersensuous things through our senses and inference based on sense perception. Brahman is immediately present and self revealed.

Radhakrishnan's main contention regarding intuition is that intuition must not be regarded as an alternative to reason, nor it must be regarded as a way of knowledge adopted in mystical experience as against, philosophical endeavour. Knowledge or the revelation of ultimate reality through personal realization is the main problem of his philosophy. Every aspect of human life and every department of knowledge is brought under the way of integral experience.

The great contribution of Radhakrishnan to Indian Philosophy is that intellect is not opposed to intuition, but completion. The dichotomy between intellect and intuition is dissolved in the ultimate experience of the Absolute. The deepest truths of life and existence are revealed more in the silent murmur of an ineffable experience than in the crowd of words. A transcendence of language and intellect is imperative if the deepest truths have to be discovered. Integral experience is the discovery of the ultimate being. The Absolute is the totality of being and also the totality of experience. So Radhakrishnan rejects the notion of the Absolute as the ahistorical being and as unconnected with the human spirit. The Absolute is responsive to the spiritual being of man. Radhakrishnan's concept of Absolute integrates
the historical being of the Absolute with the historicality of the world and man. For Radhakrishnan, the Universal Spirit and the spirit in man are one and the same. There is no dichotomy between the knower and the known, the subject and the object, because at the ultimate state of realization there is only one reality, one continuum of spiritual existence. "When the world is redeemed the end of the plot is reached. Earth and heaven would be no more; the timeless and the transcendent above remains." 4

Many contemporary philosophers reject intuition as a way of knowing. A. J. Ayer contends that knowledge does not imply any special mental state which is distinguishable from other states of mind, viz. believing, guessing, doubting etc. He further says that by assuming such special state we have created certain pseudo problems of epistemology which have given rise to metaphysical nonsense. Ayer holds "that the necessary and sufficient conditions for knowing that something is the case are first that what one is said to know be true, secondly that one be sure of it, and thirdly that one should have the right to be sure." 5 The epistemologists hold the view that any piece of information, in order to obtain the status of knowledge, must fulfil certain conditions so that knowledge can be distinguished from mere belief. The conditions are: (1) belief - condition, (2) truth condition, (3) Justification condition and (4) Justification without falsity. In other words, a rational or
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adequately grounded certitude is required. Intuitionists hold that our usual rational methods or standards of knowledge have to be replaced by a new dimension of understanding and novel standards when we deal with the vast domain of possible knowledge.

Bergson does not reject the practical value of ordinary sensations and ideas or concepts with which our intellect interprets only the aspects of reality. But intellectual analysis degrades the dynamic reality into a lifeless corpse. While in Bergson intuition is opposed to intellect, for Bradley 'Immediate Experience' transcends intellect. The Absolute for him is the coherent system of subordinate elements, each of which represents a partial truth or appearance and thus falls short of Reality or Totality to be grasped by supra-rational immediate experience. Radhakrishnan differs from both Bergson and Bradley. For Bergson, the object of intuition is the dynamic principle, called Duration. For Bradley, 'experience' has for its object the transcendental unity of transmuted appearances. For Radhakrishnan's neo-Vedāntism, integral experience grasps the dynamic Absolute. His integral experience differs in nature from the thrilling and throbbing intuition of Bergson and the triplicate fullness of thinking, feeling and willing of Bradley in their sublimated forms. It is transcendental vision which is free from doubt.6 It is not the negation of intellect, but it is non-conceptual. The movement from intellect to intuition is the movement towards the deepest rationality of which human
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nature is capable. It is asserted by Radhakrishnan that the intellect is also capable of testing the validity of certain intuitions. Thus sensuous, logical or scientific intuitions can be clearly verified in the light of reason. According to him, every experience which does not fit in with the tested knowledge must be rejected as hocus-pocus. Intuition for him is supralogical. It is the wisdom of the whole gained by the whole spirit and transcends the fragmentary knowledge, whether it be the product of feeling or intellect.

Radhakrishnan's view of intuition and intellect is grounded upon his strong conviction that man possesses a spiritual consciousness or superconsciousness over and above his animal consciousness and the ordinary self-consciousness. At this highest level of consciousness the individual becomes aware of the indubitable reality of spirit. This awareness is not an intellectual cognition of the object by the subject, but an awareness in which the eternal spirit realizes itself as the basis of all experience.

While pointing out the limitations of empirical, rational and critical methods in philosophy and accepting their limited value, Radhakrishnan has utilised intuitive method because spiritual intuition is the only method to delve deep into the recesses of spirit. He distinguishes spiritual intuition from mental, vital and instinctive intuition. As he says, "The deepest things of life are known only through intuitive apprehension."  
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Man in the world represents the same spirit at a higher level and as such, unlike material things, it is not a mere spectator in the cosmic evolution but is an active participant in it. It is possible for man to accentuate his inherent spiritual force in the intuitive experience and identify himself with the Divine. Man has the capacity of lifting himself higher in the ladder of ontological impulsion, and this is possible not through logic and linguistic analysis but through unificatory spiritual experience in which all dualisms are transcended and all antinomies get reconciled. 9