

Thomas Kadankavil  
C.S.W.R., Bangalore

## MEETING OF REASON AND INTUITION IN BELIEF

### 1. Intuition Versus Reason

One of the remarkable characteristic features of the contemporary philosophy which it has somehow revived from the religious thinkers of the past, and which is now very much appealing to the believers in some form of religious dogmas which cannot be easily established on the basis of the canons of the discursive reason in the positivist tradition, is the concept of intuition. The distrust in the power of the discursive intellect to grasp the deeper dimensions of life is a basic tenet in the thought of Henri Bergson (1859–1941). In his *Creative Evolution* (1907) he makes the antithesis between instinct and intellect essential to his philosophy. His contention is that instinct is nearer to nature than intelligence. It is not any instinct, but the instinct "that has become disinterested self-conscious, capable of reflecting upon its object and of enlarging it indefinitely," in other words, the instinct which has itself transformed into intuition, is alone competent to grasp the inwardness of evolution or life. In the religious circle this insight is identified as the search for 'the God of heart' in the place of the God of the intellect.

In this article I try to develop S. Radhakrishnan's notion of intuition as a form of belief, or a religious experience, with a view to find a solution to the apparently conflicting views that "there should be a sense or senses in which all judgement is discursive" and that "all judgement is intuitive in a general sense."<sup>1</sup> It certainly implies an attempt to reconcile the opposition between reason and intuition.

### 2. Place of Intuition in non-dual theory

The concept of intuition in the philosophy of Radhakrishnan is very fundamental to the philosophical position he holds. This concept is developed here mainly from his work *An Idealist View of Life*,<sup>2</sup> in the light of

1. Robert C. Neville, *International Philosophical Quarterly*, (Vol. VII, No. 4) p. 590.

2. S. Radhakrishnan, *An Idealist View of Life* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1932), p. 332. (Hereinafter referred to as *Idealist View*).

the analysis and criticism of the eminent scholars such as Robert W. Browning,<sup>3</sup> P.T. Raju,<sup>4</sup> D.M. Datta,<sup>5</sup> J.G. Arapura<sup>6</sup> and others.

i) *Intuition in General*

Due to the imprecision of the popular speech and owing to the very history of western thought itself, the term intuition is now very much ambiguous. K.W. Wild in her work *Intuition* has listed thirty one different meanings for this word.<sup>7</sup> She writes: "It is often used when 'instinct' would convey too much of the animal; when 'revelation' would arouse suspicion; when 'perception' would be too vague or too technical; 'rapid synthesis of judgment too prosaic; 'the fruits of experience of observation' too loose, 'innate or a priori knowledge' too disputable; or 'one with' too incomprehensible."<sup>8</sup> But Browning points out that although Radhakrishnan himself complains about this ambiguity,<sup>9</sup> he has not in any way helped us to overcome it.<sup>10</sup> In enumerating the variety of meanings Browning writes: "At places, the reader may receive the impression that intuition is cognitively incorrigible or infallible; in other contexts it is asserted that intuitions should be probed and evaluated."<sup>11</sup> The present discussion is mainly concerned with the clarification of Radhakrishnan's claim of the infallibility of intuition and the question of its verification.

The concept of intuition plays a central role in the Philosophy of Radhakrishnan especially when he relates the concept of God with that of the Absolute. For him God is the truth for our intellect and the Absolute is the truth for our intuition.<sup>12</sup>

3. Cfr. Paul Arthur Schilpp. (ed.) *The Philosophy of S. Radhakrishnan* (New York: Tudor Publishing Co., 1952) pp. 175-277.

4. P.T. Raju, *Idealistic Thought of India* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1953).

5. D.M. Datta, *The Chief Currents of Contemporary Philosophy* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1961).

6. J.G. Arapura, *Radhakrishnan and Integral Experience* (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1962).

7. K.W. Wild, *Intuition* (Cambridge: University Press, 1938) pp. 210-221.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

9. *Idealist View*, p. 200.

10. Paul A. Schilpp (ed.), *The Philosophy of S. Radhakrishnan*, pp. 177-178.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 178.

12. S. Radhakrishnan, *Eastern Religion and Western Thought* (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 63.

For Radhakrishnan, however, God is not mere appearance of the Absolute, as in Sankara or Bradley, but is the very absolute viewed from a particular point of view in which it is actualized. When the absolute is viewed from this actuality, it is God. But viewed apart from that actuality, it is the Absolute.<sup>13</sup> Just as God and Absolute are not different, but the one is the completion of the other, the intellect is not different from intuition but is its completion.

## ii) *Nature of Intuition*

Intuition is described as one of the forms of knowledge. According to his classification there are basically three types of cognition. "It is produced in three ways; they are sense experience, discursive reasoning, and intuitive apprehension."<sup>14</sup> The intuition occupies the highest place in the scale of knowledge, because it is the result of a long and arduous process of study and analysis;<sup>15</sup> it is not discursive;<sup>16</sup> "it is the response of the whole man to the reality; and so "it is an integral experience;<sup>17</sup> it is beyond reason, though not against reason;<sup>18</sup> intuitive knowledge is distinct from mere imagination;<sup>19</sup> being ineffable and non-propositional, it is not knowledge; but as having the test of assurance and certainty this intuitive insight is a species of knowledge;<sup>20</sup> it is also not instinct, for it is conscious like intellect;<sup>21</sup> there is no break of continuity between intuition and intellect;<sup>22</sup> intuitive knowledge is not non-rational; it is only non-conceptual;<sup>23</sup> "the truths of intuition

13. A few texts from *An Idealist View of Life* concerning the distinction between the concept of God and Absolute: a) "God, who is organic with the universe, recedes into the background of the Absolute." (p. 340); b) "God as the author of the order of universe is not the God of religion." (p.333); c) "God is organically bound up with the universe, the Absolute is not." (p. 343); d) "The Absolute is the pre-cosmic nature of God and God is the Absolute from the cosmic point of view;" e) "God is, so to say, the genius of the world, its ground." (p. 345).

14. *Idealist View*, p. 134.

15. S. Radhakrishnan, "*The Spirit in Man*" in *Contemporary Indian Philosophy*, (London: George Allen & Unwin 1939), p. 488. (Hereinafter referred to as *The Spirit in Man*).

16. *Idealist View*, p. 142.

17. *The Spirit in Man*, p. 486.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 486.

19. *Idealist View*, p. 143.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 145.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 216.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 153.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 153.

are led up to the understanding and can be translated into the language of the understanding;<sup>24</sup> intuition is immanent in the very nature of our thinking; the proof of the validity of our intuitive knowledge is somewhat similar to Kant's proof of *a-priori* elements.<sup>25</sup>

Certain confusion regarding the nature of intuition is inevitable from the above account and it gives rise to a general suspicion about its validity. Yet Radhakrishnan writes: "Intuition is not used as an apology for doctrines which either could not or would not be justified on intellectual grounds. It is not shadowy sentiment or pathological fancy fit for cranks and dancing dervishes.<sup>26</sup> Again he writes in *An Idealist View of Life*: "It is not fancy or make believe, but a *bonda fide* discovery of reality."<sup>27</sup> If Radhakrishnan conceives the intuitive insight as something genuine and valid in the field of philosophico-religious experience, it is certainly worth examining.

### iii) *The problem of intuition*

The initial problem is to decide the method with which the issue of intuition can be tackled. Robert Browning takes the freedom to make use of the framework of western philosophy to give an outline of and exposition of Radhakrishnan's views on intuition on the plea that the patient cannot speak to the physician in medical idiom, but that he has to use his own language. Even if the western man is very ill with his hypertrophy or discursive reasoning he must express himself in accordance with his own experience.<sup>28</sup> Thus Browning makes use of the epistemological framework of Western philosophy to explain the concept of intuition in Radhakrishnan. But to analyse it J.G. Arapura starts from "the principal metaphysical idea which is the bed-rock of Radhakrishnan's thought,<sup>29</sup> namely, the integral experience and he tries to explain it in its general orientation to modern European thought. With the aid of the scholars mentioned above we shall search for the real meaning of the integral experience."

24. *The Spirit in Man* (1936) p. 268.

25. *Idealist View*, p. 156.

26. *The Spirit in Man* (1939) p. 486-87.

27. *Idealist View.*, p. 143.

28. Schilpp, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

29. Arapura, *op. cit.*, p. vii.

### 3. The Philosophy of Integral Experience

The author's philosophical endeavour appears to be a response to the Kantian epistemological agnosticism and the various "substitutes for religion" such as naturalistic atheism, agnosticism, scepticism, humanism, pragmatism, modernism and authoritarianism. On the contrary the immediate sources in the western philosophy from which he drew his inspiration were absolute idealism, intuitionism and mysticism of Hegel, Henry Bergson and Rudolf Otto respectively. Absolute idealism transcended the halting idealism of the unknowability of the thing-in-itself. But the Bergsonian intuitionism, having agreed with Kant that reality is not knowable by means of the intellect, went beyond the Kantian agnosticism and asserted its knowability through intuition rather than by the postulation of practical reason.<sup>30</sup> Rudolf Otto points out that mysticism refers to something much more deeper<sup>31</sup> than what the pure reason of Kant presents and that it can be interpreted from the experience of the 'holy,' which, according to him, is an apriori category of the Kantian type.<sup>32</sup> He gives the name 'numinous' to 'the holy,' implying the suggestion that this is the noumenon of Kant. Although this reality is conceived to be "wholly other" and transcendent, he refutes Kant's argument that the transcendent reality is unknowable by any means whatsoever. Thus Otto's attempt has given mysticism a new relevance for epistemological investigation. Radhakrishnan has constructed an epistemology of his own taking certain elements from absolute idealism, intuitionism and mysticism.<sup>33</sup> Arapura writes; "... by a process of plastic re-interpretation of these three, as well as of the epistemology of Vedanta, he weaves a new pattern of perennial philosophy. This pattern is designated by the phrase integral experience."<sup>34</sup>

*Advaita* vedanta too joined hands with the other three systems in attacking the agnostic position of Kant and emphasized the absolute necessity of self-evidence in knowledge in formulating a valid metaphysical theory of reality.<sup>35</sup> Being self-evident, it need not be proved; but it is knowable and known, not indeed as object, but as subject, being

30. Cf. Henri Bergson, *Creative Evolution* (trans.) Arthur Michell, (London: Macmillan & Co., 1914), pp. 356-63.

31. Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of Holy* (trans.) John Harvey (London: Oxford University Press, 1925) p. 116.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 116.

33. Arapura, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

itself the real knower. This concept of integral experience is developed gradually in the writings of Radhakrishnan.

i) *A Dynamic type of Absolutism*

In his early work *The Reign of Religion in contemporary Philosophy*<sup>36</sup> Radhakrishnan holds that only a dynamic and true monism could account for the growing universe with its time and change.<sup>37</sup> He believes that the systems which play the game of philosophy squarely and fairly will naturally end in an absolute idealism. Taking inspiration from the *Upanishads* he tried to demonstrate that reality is the whole, the Absolute, which is the highest concrete, and is so rich that its wealth of content refuses to be completely articulated by the intellect. But "the intellect has access to it, although 'it can never exhaust its fulness.'<sup>38</sup> Although he admits that the "Hindu systems of thought believe in the power of the human mind to lead us to all truth,"<sup>39</sup> he also reminds us that our ordinary mind is not the highest possible order of mind. "It can rise to a level almost inconceivable to us,"<sup>40</sup> where one can find the reality of intuition.

ii) *Reason into Intuition*

In his *An Idealist View of Life*, Radhakrishnan conceived intuition as the faculty of the mind that enriches reason and he made it fit to know reality. There is a correspondence between the ultimate constitution of the human mind and reality.<sup>41</sup> Though reason does not constitute it,<sup>42</sup> it must be in touch with the vital springs of the mind, namely, intuition and must be energized by it. Intuition is the very basis of the intellect, thought or reason<sup>43</sup> or the "whole man." He writes: "It (intuition) is the wisdom gained by the whole spirit."<sup>44</sup> To know the inner nature of reality "we must resort to the whole personality of which intellect is only a part."<sup>45</sup>

---

36. S. Radhakrishnan, *The Reign of Religion in Contemporary Philosophy* (London; Macmillan & Co., 1920).

37. *Ibid.*, p. 171.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 440.

39. *The Spirit in Man*, p. 484.

40. *Ibid.*, p. 484.

41. *Idealist View*, p. 170.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 164.

44. *Ibid.*, p. 147.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 144.

Intuitive knowledge "arises from an intimate fusion of mind with reality" ... "it is knowledge by being and not by senses or symbols. It is awareness of the truth of things by identity."<sup>46</sup> Again it is not a mystic process; but it involves the most direct and penetrating examination possible for human mind.<sup>47</sup> Strictly speaking logical knowledge, in contrast to intuition, is non-knowledge (*avidya*) valid only till intuition arises.<sup>48</sup>

### iii) *A Mystical Faculty*

But intuition is transcended or transformed in mysticism. Mysticism is intuition turned on God, the deepest of all realities.<sup>49</sup> Radhakrishnan is affirmative to the question whether there is a mystical or religious faculty in the sense of Rudolf Otto's "numinous sense." For him "religion is in essence, experience or living contact with ultimate reality"<sup>50</sup> and that the religious or the mystical faculty is "the spiritual sense, the instinct for the real, which is not satisfied with anything less than the absolute and eternal."<sup>51</sup>

This special faculty has to be located in the comprehensive whole of personality due to several reasons: a) "... we are compelled to relate our intuitive experiences with others and here we are obliged to employ formulas"<sup>52</sup> b) "to impart our experiences to others and to elucidate their implication for the rest of our life,"<sup>53</sup> it is necessary that the mystical faculty works in close cooperation with other faculties: c) mystical experience is rarely realized. "There is no such thing as pure experience, raw and undigested. It is always mixed up with layers of interpretations."<sup>54</sup> In short it is reasonable to admit the existence of a mystical faculty for the unmistakable knowledge and experience of God, which works in close cooperation with other cognitive faculties.

### iv) *The non-dual experience*

Radhakrishnan accepted the advaitic doctrine of the self-luminosity or evidence of truth and tried to expand it by developing a theory of integrat-

46. *Ibid.*, p. 138.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 146.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 146.

49. *Ibid.*, pp. 219-20.

50. *The Spirit in Man*, p. 492.

51. *Idealist View*, p. 89.

52. *Ibid.*, p. 98.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 98.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 99.

ed experience through the combination of reason, intuition and mystical experience. The fundamental difference between the traditional vedantists and Radhakrishnan lies in the fact that for the former the data of reason, intuition and religious experience are only steps leading to the Absolute knowledge based on the subject alone (I am) and for the latter they are integral elements constituting the absolute knowledge. In this version of *advaita* Radhakrishnan has his own map of human mind. This plan of human mind is clearly drawn in his essay *The Spirit in Man*. There he describes it as an integral consciousness within the religious faculty situated at the centre, because man is inescapably a religious being.

#### 4. Relation between Intuition and Integral Experience

In order to bring to light the distinction between reason, intuition and mystical experience the nature of integral experience is to be explained further. It is the effect of the combined work of different cognitive faculties. It has implications for different types of knowledge in science, art and ethics. Radhakrishnan himself admits different types of intuition. Neither sense-perception nor reason is really exempt from the pervasive power of intuition. It binds them together and links them with the highest intuition which is mystical. "Personally I use intuition for integral experience."<sup>55</sup> He classifies them into two groups: Intuition is of two kinds, : perceptual knowledge and integral experience."<sup>56</sup> The latter alone is considered as the proper, infallible, intuition. It is self-evident. The quality of being is the perfection of a subject or self. For *advaita* (Philosophy of non-duality) the subject is an unanalysable, unitary consciousness which is evidence to itself (*svayamsiddha*). Radhakrishnan's theory of integral experience is an attempt to give an explanation to the *advaitic* doctrine in terms of the synthetic whole of the epistemological factors in a personal being.

#### 5. Further notes on Intuition in Integral-Experience

##### i) *Kinds of Intuitions*

Robert W. Browning classifies a wide variety of "intuitions" under five categories:

- a) Sensory intuition
- b) Rational intuition

55. Schilpp, *op. cit.*, p. 791.

56. *Ibid.*, p. 791,



- c) The intuition implied in detecting the complex structures of fact and possible facts
- d) Valuational intuition
- e) Integral experience.

Browning observes that Radhakrishnan never admitted the first two,<sup>57</sup> or probably the first three of these as intuition. The mathematical thinking formulation of scientific hypothesis, intuitions in philosophy, the apprehension of logical connections etc, normally come under the third category of intuition. To a certain extent, Radhakrishnan also admitted it as a form of intuition.<sup>58</sup> But the fourth namely, the valuational intuition is the intuition proper for Radhakrishnan. It contains several sub-classes such as moral and aesthetic intuitions and intuitions in the form of religious experience. The intuition called integral experience is a sub-species in the genus of religious insight.

## ii) *Valuational Intuition*

Before coming to the discussion of the particular type of intuition called non-dual or integral experience, we may add a few remarks on valuational intuition.

57. *Ibid.*, pp. 181-182.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 189. The postulation of pure sensory given can be taken as an instance of sensory intuition. Our author tacitly accepts it. (*Indian Philosophy*, Vol. II p. 303). But he does not call it intuition. The intuitions of meanings and the relations of meanings are instances of the *rational intuitions*. They can be classified as conscious perception and unconscious perception. Radhakrishnan does not accept the first as intuition. He labels it as the 'logic of proof.' (Cfr. *Idealist View*, p. 177). He would accept, it seems, the unconscious perception of connection as intuition. But such an intuition comes practically with in the third category of intuition. Its nature is made more clear in the following citations from *An Idealist View of Life*: 1) *In Logic*: "In every logical proof there is an intuition of the whole" (p. 181). All dynamic acts of thinking whether in a game of chess or a mathematical problem, are controlled by an intuitive grasp of the situation as a whole" (p. 149). 2) *In Science*: "The art of discovery is confused with logic of proof . . . we forget that we invent by intuition . . ." (p. 177). ". . . logic cannot dictate or set limits to the course of nature and progress of discovery." (p. 130). "The great scientific discoveries are due to the inventive genius of the creative thinkers and not the plodding process of the intellect" (p. 149). 3) *In Philosophy*: "Logic believes that . . . the world is an ordered whole. It is not arrived at by any speculative construction; we have not searched the outermost bounds of nature or the innermost recesses of the soul to be able to say that the systematic unity of the world is a logical conclusion" (p. 154).

According to Radhakrishnan, contemporary man, western man at any rate, with his insistence on "critical intelligence,"<sup>59</sup> is doing well enough with the intuitions of classes one to three. He is miserably underdeveloped, says Radhakrishnan, in the case of fourth and fifth type and he admonishes that "we must recapture the intuitive power that have been allowed to go astray in the stress of life."<sup>60</sup> Based on his description, the intrinsic values in the valuational intuition can be grouped under three headings, namely a) Moral, b) Aesthetic and c) Religious.

a) *Moral Intuition*

In his discussion on moral intuition emphasis is laid own the 'phenomenon of the moral hero.' "Though morality commands conformity, all moral progress is due to non-conformists."<sup>61</sup> Socrates and Jesus were unlike the conventional good men. They quite failed to exhibit the common virtue of prudence.<sup>62</sup> Radhakrishnan contrasted these phenomena of the moral intuitions with the ordinary ethics, which he depicted as routine, mechanical or formulized rational ethics.<sup>63</sup> Here morality is based on the 'creative decision' of the individual.

b) *Aesthetic Intuition*

To explain the nature of aesthetic intuition a few text from the writings of the author could be cited. "Aesthetic perception is done with the whole self."<sup>64</sup> "No two men can ever produce the same work of art, for art is the expression of the whole self."<sup>65</sup> Art gives us a sense of the meaningfulness of life, evokes in us ideas of the larger beauty, justice and charity of the universe."<sup>66</sup> Although artists as a class are not "patterns of morality" there is a close relation between morality and art. "Strictly speaking an art independent of morality which has no roots in our deepest ethical instincts, which does not draw towards the divine in things, is not true art."<sup>67</sup> "All great artists, who have the subtle spiritual appeal, convey a stillness, a remoteness, a sense of the beyond, the far away."<sup>68</sup>

59. *Idealist View*, p. 129.

60. *The Spirit in Man*, p. 270.

61. *Idealist View*, p. 197.

62. *The Spirit in Man*, p. 273.

63. *Ibid.*, p. 275.

64. *Ibid.*, p. 269.

65. *Idealist View*, p. 147.

66. *Ibid.*, p. 194.

67. *Ibid.*, p. 201.

68. *The Spirit in Man*, p. 272.

c) *Intuitive Religious Experience*

Religious consciousness is an autonomous form of spiritual life.<sup>69</sup> It is not reducible either to intellectual or to ethical or aesthetic activity or to a sum of it.<sup>70</sup> It is a form of faith or intuition because spiritual perception, like other kind of perceptions, is liable to error and requires the testing processes of logical thought.<sup>71</sup> Yet genuine "Intuitions abide, while interpretations change."<sup>72</sup> Thus according to Radhakrishnan there is a mode of consciousness which is distinct from the perceptual, imaginative or intellectual and carries with it self-evidence and completedness.<sup>73</sup> This is the intuition in religion.

**6. Intuition Proper as Integral Experience**

i) *A Species of Religious Experience*

The ordinary religious experience can be certainly distinguished from the intuitive life of saints and seers. The latter form of experience is called "integral" experience. The former exhibits a pluralistic consciousness,<sup>74</sup> the latter, the highest mystical intuition, the heart of integral experience, is a 'super-conscious' state which is non-plural and non-dual.<sup>75</sup> It is impersonal and super-personal.<sup>76</sup> It is in continuity with the former: "There is a continuity to maturity even though the latter culminates in the ecstatic."<sup>77</sup> He writes: "There is an ultimate goal which is beyond the conditions of progress." "This religious or intuitional experience is the summit of the whole evolution."<sup>78</sup> In a number of ways Radhakrishnan explains the nature of this experience. It is the fulfilment of all other intuitions; foundation of all forms of knowledge, including logical;<sup>79</sup> felt to be itself sufficient and complete: there can be no possibility of

69. *Ibid.*, p. 275.

70. *Idealist View*, p. 199.

71. S. Radhakrishnan, *The Hindu View of Life* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1927), p. 16.

72. *Idealist View*, p. 90.

73. *Ibid.*, p. 90.

74. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

75. S. Radhakrishnan, *Eastern Religion and Western Thought* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 50.

76. *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. III, p. 356.

77. *Eastern Religion and Western Thought*, p. 303.

78. *Idealist View*, p. 303.

79. Schilpp, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

doubt about the experience itself; but we may quarrel about the implication of this kind of experience; does not normally occur;<sup>80</sup> does not need other proof but constrains acceptance and so it is self established, self-evidencing, self-luminous (*svayamprakasa*); it possesses the character of revelation: we do not know how or why they occur; those who are gifted with the insight tend to regard themselves as the privileged few;<sup>81</sup> it gives them a new vision and inward peace; it is ineffable and conceptual substitutes are inadequate; it is an independent function of the mind, something unique, possessing an autonomous character; it is something inward and personal which unifies all values and organizes all personal experiences; it urges the individual to adopt an attitude of faith to posit the transcendental reality.<sup>82</sup>

We cannot let it function in isolation from other powers of man because the independence of mystical experience is only theoretical and in practical field it is a rare occurrence and that too is mixed up with imperfections.<sup>83</sup> Responsible mystics starts a process of reflection immediately after the ineffable experience to transform it into a useful form of knowledge in the historical and social sense.

The historical aspect of knowledge consists in the mystics attempt to clear up his own doubt about his experience; the social aspect consists in communicating his experience and thus removing the doubts of others. The acknowledgement of the need of confirmation and verification does not rule out the validity of the experience itself. "In the utterance of the seers, we have to distinguish the given and the interpreted elements. We must distinguish the immediate experience or intuition which might conceivably be infallible and the interpretation which is mixed up with it."<sup>84</sup> The authority of the authors of the Vedas can be understood as that of the experts in the field of religion. Radhakrishnan, however, believes that "the truths revealed in the vedas are capable of being re-experienced on compliance with ascertained conditions."<sup>85</sup>

---

80. *Idealist View*, p. 92.

81. *Ibid.*, p. 94.

82. *Ibid.*, pp. 88-96.

83. *Ibid.*, p. 94.

84. *Ibid.*, p. 98.

85. *Hindu View of Life*, p. 17.

ii) *Mystical Experience as Integral experience*

Integral experience is the fulness of mystical intuition, reason and feeling. It is visualized as the completion of all of them in their togetherness and integrity. It is the fulfilment of mysticism. The various aspects of this fulfilment are: a) the unity of the apparatus of knowledge, i.e., the whole of person's power around the mystical experience, b) the conception of the 'Absolute Beyond' of the mystical experience as the unity of the Beyond and the universe and, c) the integration of the subject and the object in the place of the otherness of the mystical experience.<sup>86</sup> These characteristic notes of integral experience reveal how the mystical intuition in general has grown into a particular type of mystical intuition, namely, an experience of a unitary mysticism in faith.

## 6. Conclusion

In the foregoing account an attempt is made to explain the concept of integral experience based on an infallible intuition on which Radhakrishnan's philosophy of religion or spirit is based. The description of integral experience is an elaboration of the Vedantic theory of the self-evidence of the subject. It is taken here from a religious rather than a logical point of view. No proof is offered with regard to its existence and validity. Radhakrishnan takes Vedanta itself as a religion and not as a form of pure philosophy. Hence it cannot be easily accepted or rejected on the basis of the epistemological principles known and accepted in the contemporary western philosophy. As every approach to religious truth implicitly requires a faith in its truth, our author's approach to the Vedantic truth, i.e., integral experience also implies a faith in its truth.

As regards infallible intuition, Radhakrishnan admits that "simply because the deliverances of intuition appears incontestable to the seer... it does not follow that they are true."<sup>87</sup> We certainly need a criterion to distinguish between genuine and spurious intuitions. According to Radhakrishnan, through genuine mystical experience one gets infallible knowledge which can be tested on rational grounds.<sup>88</sup> The rational ground he suggests for testing its truth is consistency. "We have now to show that the general character of the universe as known is quite consistent with

86. Arapura, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

87. *The Spirit in Man*, p. 270.

88. Cfr. Schilpp, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

this intuited certainty of God,"<sup>89</sup> for "the religious intuition required to be reconciled with the scientific account of the universe."<sup>90</sup> The author does not tell us by what practical means the consistency of truths found in different levels of mind can be achieved. Yet he stands by his *original faith* that the truths revealed in the Vedas can be re-experienced on compliance with certain conditions laid down by them. At this level of experience the distinction between reason and intuition, and intuition and faith or belief becomes meaningless.

---

89. *Idealist View*, p. 222.

90. *Ibid.*, p. 222.