UNIT 11: RADHAKRISHNAN: INTELLECT AND INTUITION

UNIT STRUCTURE

11.1 Learning objectives

11.2 Introduction

11.3 Different ways of knowing

11.4 Nature of Intellect

11.5 Radhakrishnan's critique of intellect

11.6 Nature of intuition

11.7 Different senses of intuition

11.8 Radhakrishnan and other thinkers

11.9 Intellect and intuition

11.10 Let us sum up

11.11 Further reading

11.12 Answers to check your progress

11.13 Model questions

11.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to

- explain the different ways of knowing according to Radhakrishnan
- discuss the nature of intellect and intuition according to Radhakrishnan
- Analyze the role of intellect in the apprehension of Reality
- discuss the points of limitation of intellect as put forward by Radhakrishnan
- discuss Radhakrishnan's concept of intuition with those other Indian and Western thinkers
- Describe the relation between intellect and intuition.

11.2 INTRODUCTION

This dnit introduces you to the problem as to the nature of intellect

and intuition and their relation according to Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, the foremost contemporary Indian thinker of the last century has developed a philosophy of synthesis of the two great traditions of the East and the West. Following the classical Vedantic traditions of India he examined all the important views of the Western thinkers like Plato, Descartes, Spinoza, Bradley and Bergson Radhakrishnan propounded an epistemological doctrine to justify metaphysical assertions. The three ways of knowing reality, according to Radhakrishnan, are**: *sense-experience, discursive reasoning, and intuitive apprehension.*** Sense experience helps us to acquire the knowledge of the outer characters of the external world. Discursive reasoning provides logical knowledge by the process of analysis and synthesis of the perceived data. But both these kinds of knowledge are inadequate to apprehend the reality. So to have an integral view of reality, we must transcend logical reasoning. According to Radhakrishnan, it is possible only through intuition that reveals the whole spirit which he regarded as the integral experience. But Radhakrishnan has not totally rejected the role of intellect; on the other hand it has been taken by him as a supplementary factor in the process of apprehension of reality. Intellect and intuition are thus not considered as opposed to each other. Radhakrishnan never regards them as constituting any kind of polarity. Rather, he maintains continuity between intuition and intellect.

11.3 DIFFERENT WAYS OF KNOWING

According to Radhakrishnan there are three ways of knowing reality: **sense-experience, discursive reasoning and intuitive apprehension.**

The knowledge of the sensible qualities of the external world is obtained through **sense -experience**. It provides data to natural sciences by gathering impression of the physical objects. Sense – experience can provide only empirical knowledge; they are not able to apprehend the reality. But Radhakrishnan does not condemn sense

experience. He holds that sense experience has a very important role to play in the knowing process.

Discursive reasoning provides logical knowledge by the process of analysis and synthesis of the perceived data. So this kind of knowledge is indirect as it depends upon perception. It is symbolic in its character.

Intuitive knowledge is non-sensuous, immediate knowledge. It is distinguished from indirect, mediate, rational or inferential knowledge. The role of discursive reasoning has never been nullified by Radhakrishnan. Intellectual knowledge is a pre-condition for the intuitive grasp of reality.

Intuitive knowledge is knowledge by being. It is an immediate cognition or consciousness. It is very difficult to give a correct definition of intuition like other means of knowledge because of its unique character of inexpressibility. As distinct from sense-knowledge or 'pratyaska' and intellectual knowledge the term 'Aparoksha' is used by the Hindu thinkers for unique non-sensuous immediate cognition. Following the classical Vedantic tradition of India Radhakrishnan accepts intuition as a means of knowing. He has also shown its relation to other forms of knowing. In this regard he has also examined all the important views of the western thinkers. Intuition is regarded as the integral whole. The essence of reality is apprehended only in intuition.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: What are the ways of knowing reality?

.....

.....

Q 2: What is sense perception?

.....

.....

Q 3: What is discursive reasoning?

.....

.....

Q 4: What is intuition?

.....

.....

Q 5: Does Radhakrishnan condemn sense experience?

.....

.....

Q 6: Is the knowledge of intellect symbolic in character?

.....

.....

11.4 NATURE OF INTELLECT

Discursive reasoning is intellectual cognition. Discursive reasoning gives us the knowledge of both the internal and the external through the employment of concepts and symbols. So it is indirect and symbolic in its character. It gives us logical knowledge.

Intellectual knowledge is obtained by the process of analysis and synthesis of perceived data. So in intellectual knowledge we have a more systematic knowledge of the object perceived; because the data supplied by the senses are analyzed and a new synthesis is made.

In intellectual cognition there is always a separation between the knower and the known, the subject and the object.

Conceptual knowledge is dependent on our perceptions, our interests and our capacities. It helps us to handle and control the object and its workings. Intellectual knowledge is not immediate. What we get in intellect is a partial response to the reality.

LET US KNOW



The idea of spirit is the root concept of Radhakrishnan's philosophy. But he conceives the spirit not as a substance but as life. The self, Godand Absolute are all names of the one universal spirit in its differentaspects. The Absolute is the total spiritual reality,

manifested andunmanifested, actual and potential, realized and unrealized. The worldis the manifestation of the absolute spirit in time. God is the absoluteconsidered as the ground of the world.

11.5 RADHAKRISHNAN'S CRITICISM OF INTELLECT

Radhakrishnan has pointed out the validity and invalidity of intellect. Intellect by itself cannot form its own data. It depends on data supplied by sense-experience. Sense- experience is directly related to the apparent of the reality. At the very first, intellect is not able to grasp the reality.

But Radhakrishnan's critique of intellect is not the total denial of the role of intellect in the apprehension of reality; on the contrary by criticizing intellect he only tries to limit its scope. He does not deny its significance and importance. The limitation of intellect, according to Radhakrishnan, is that it cannot be regarded as an independent method in the apprehension of reality. According to him, what the intellect investigates is not the unreal, though it is not absolutely real. Radhakrishnan has shown the limitations of intellect in the following way.

- Intellect does not touch the reality in itself. It concerns with the appearance of reality.
- Being analytic in nature intellectual knowledge fails to give a unified knowledge. According to Radhakrishnan it deals with relations but cannot grasp the relationless absolute.
- Intellect is always dichotomous. It can never overcome the dichotomy of subject-object relation. Knowledge is an intense and close communion between the knower and the known. But in intellectual knowledge the duality between the subject experiencing and object experienced is distinctly observed. So, the Reality which is a non-dual pure identity is beyond the reach of the discursive intellect.
- Intellectual knowledge is symbolic and conceptual. Concepts are formed by abstracting the universal essence of individuals and thus it refers only symbolic character of knowledge.

- Concepts are static. But reality is dynamic, which con not be touched by intellect.
- Again, conceptual knowledge is concerned with objective knowledge. But reality is apprehended in an immediate individual experience. So intellect fails to grasp the whole truth, the whole spirit. Therefore, Radhakrishnan says, what is immediately apprehended is different from what is conceptually constructed.
- According to Radhakrishnan, thought reveals reality, because they are one in essence; but they are different in existence at the empirical level. Knowing a thing and being it are different.
- As intellect is of temporal process; it is limited and finite. It is subject to correction. So Radhakrishnan holds that thought needs verification.Thought, according to him, is a means of partially manifesting and presenting the self-existent knowledge.
- Intellectual knowledge is possible only when the data are supplied from somewhere else. But there are some aspects of reality of which the sense experience can not supply their data, e.g. the emotion of anger. Because, before intellect can analyze the mood of anger, we must get at it. We know what it is to be angry by being angry.
- Intellect tries to synthesize the different data of sense-experience. Actually it fails to synthesize in a harmonious way.

But Radhakrishnan can not be said to be an anti-intellectualist. He has only shown the limitation of intellect. In Indian philosophy, since the Upanishadic period reasoning or tarka is rejected as the source of knowing the ultimate reality. According to Sankara also discursive reasoning can not grasp the reality. This attitude of Sankara influences Radhakrishnan. But Radhakrishnan criticizes intellect from his own view points. He tries to limit its scope. He considers it to be limited, incomplete and imperfect.



LET US KNOW

Descartes: French Philosopher Descartes (1596-1650) was a modernrationalistic philosopher.

Spinoza: Baruch (Benedict) de Spinoza (1632-1677) was a rationalisticPhilosopher.

Bradley: Francis Herbert Bradley (1846-1924) was an idealistic Philosopher.

Bergson: French philosopher Henry Bergson (1859-1941) was a popular figure in the anti-rationalistic movement of the present century.

11.6 NATURE OF INTUITION

Besides sense-experience and intellect, Radhakrishnan has accepted a third source of knowing called intuition to justify the metaphysical doctrine which is termed 'Aparoksha' by the Indian philosophers. Literally intuition means to 'look at' or the direct vision or immediate awareness of something. Thus, direct perception or simple and steady looking upon an object is intuition. Epistemologically intuition stands for self-evidence. It is very difficult to define intuition because of its unique character of inexpressibility. Radhakrishnan describes intuitive faculty as the whole mind, involving the exercise of the whole personality. He believes intuition as the source of philosophical and religious insight. Radhakrishnan's concept about intuitive knowledge can be expressed by indicating the following points:

- Intuitive knowledge is non-sensuous and immediate. Even sense-perception is a sense mediate, since it comes through the medium of sense-organs. It is more immediate than sensory intuition.
- Intuitive knowledge arises from an intimate fusion of mind with reality. It is knowledge by being and not by senses or by symbols. It is awareness of the truth of things by identity. The object is

known, is seen not as an object outside the self but as a part of the self.

- Intuitive knowledge is subjective, intimately personal; but it is not limited by its scope.
- Intuitive knowledge is direct, complete, absolute and the perfect knowledge of reality. Intuition is not only a perfect knowledge but also a living. It is distinguished from indirect, mediate, rational or inferential knowledge.
- In intuitive knowledge there is no duality between subject and object. In the intuitive awareness of the self as real being, there is only a logical distinction; but no real distinction between subject and object. Radhakrishnan says, 'That which knows and that which is known are really the same thing'.
- Intuition is self-establishing, self-evidencing, unitary and eternal. It does not lose its validity in individuality. Intuition is ineffable. It is self revealing.
- Intuition reveals the whole spirit of man. Radhakrishnan regards it as the integral whole into which all the aspects of mind properly cultivated will develop and will also be merged.
- In intuitive apprehension the controlling power is present as much as in perceptual acts or reflective thought. The objects of intuition are recognized and created by us. They are not produced by the act of apprehension itself.
- Intuition is distinguished from intellect but not opposed to it. Intuition is related to intellect as the whole is related to its parts.
- Intuition is immanent in the very nature of our thought as it is emphatically dependent upon thought. It depends on intellect for its verification. So it is not an independent source of knowing reality.Intuition depends on intellect and also transcends it.
- Intuition comprehends sense and intellect. It is all comprehensive because it can move upward to mystical experience and downward to reason. Nothing is external to it.

- As a means of knowing intuition is distinguished from imagination. It is not fancy belief, but a bona-fide discovery of reality.
- Intuition differs from instinct. Instinct is present in all the living species. There are certain qualities in which intuition shares with instinct such as directness, spontaneity and a closer contact with life. Though both are purposive, instinct is the lowest grade of consciousness and thus the scope of instinct is limited.
- Intuition is not a mystic process. According to Radhakrishnan it is the most direct and penetrating examination possible for the human mind. Intuition is neither supernatural nor opposed to reason.

Thus, intuition is distinguished from other mental faculties of human being. The great illustration of intuitive knowledge given by Hindu thinkers is the knowledge of self. We become aware of our own self, as we become aware of love or anger, directly by a sort of identity with it. Self-knowledge is inseparable from self-existence. Sankara says that self-knowledge which is neither logical nor sensuous is the presupposition of every other kind of knowledge. The self is the first absolute certainty, the foundation of all logical proofs. The inmost being is revealed in intuitive knowledge. In the intuitive awareness of the self there is no real distinction between subject and object.

The deepest things of life are known only through intuitive apprehension. We recognize their truth but we do not reason about them. All creative works in science and philosophy, art and life are inspired by intuitive experience.

Radhakrishnan believes that every true religion is based on intuition. For him in our ethical life also, intuitive insight is essential to ascertain the true knowledge of the values.



CHECH YOUR PROGRESS

Q 7: What is the literal meaning of intuition?

.....

Q 8: State whether the following statements are true or false

a) Intellect is an independent method in the apprehension of reality.

b) Intellect is always dichotomous.

c) According to Radhakrishnan, reality is dynamic.

d) Radhakrishnan is not an anti-intellectualist.

11.7 DIFFERENT SENSES OF INTUITION

Radhakrishnan has used intuition in different senses, the culmination of all is found in integral experience. Firstly, intuition is used by Radhakrishnan in generic and specific senses. In the generic sense, 'intuitive apprehension' is used to have a wide range, from the most sensuous intuition right up to the mystical. It is taken as a connecting link between reason and intuition.

In its specific sense intuition implies feeling and mystical experience. So there are reason, intuition and mystical experience. The greatest of them is mystical experience which is unique and different from the others and yet is the crown and apex of knowledge.

However, Radhakrishnan holds that there is continuity among the three modes of knowledge, namely, sense-perception, discursive thinking and intuition. For him each of these is productive of knowledge. But the pervasive power of intuition binds sense-perception and intellect together and links them with the highest intuition which is mystical.

Sense-perception and intuition are similar as both are immediate knowledge. Even in intellectual work there is scope for intuition. Thus, intuition is of *two* kinds; and *perceptual knowledge*and*integral experience*. But Radhakrishnan clarifies his own position and states, "Personally I use intuition for integral experience".

Usually, intuition is used in an exclusive as well as an inclusive sense which means mystical experience alone or mystical experience plus all other experiences where mystical experience is involved, taken together comprehensively.

By further analysis Radhakrishnan has distinguished another two forms of intuition as *'empirical'* and *'mystical'*. Reason and feeling belong to the order of finite experiences and thus they are known as empirical intuition.

The notion of reason is also used by Radhakrishnan in a special sense, as he distinguishes it from systematic logical processes. Intuition of feeling is experienced at the primitive level of sense-experience.

Reason and feeling are not taken by Radhakrishnan in the sense of an unlinked abstract relation. Rather, these two are taken as complementary to each other. Within the rational intuition and intuition of feeling there is an intrinsic movement which progresses to mystical intuition.

Mystical insight is a faculty of divine insight present in human consciousness.

As intuition implies unity between the knower and the known, thus sense-perception, reason and mystical experience represent the various degrees of unity.

Unity found in the order of feeling is a psychological unity, logical unity is found in rational intuition and spiritual unity is found in mystical intuition. All these different forms of intuition culminate in the integral experience.

The unities established by the intuition of feeling and rational intuition are partial. The absolute or mystical intuition stands to reason and feeling as a whole to parts. Mystical intuition is an autonomous rise of mind to the level of Supra-conscious stage beyond the limit of finite human consciousness. Thus, it distinguishes itself from other forms of intuition which occur in ordinary level of consciousness. The moments of mystic vision are too transitory and cannot be grasped. It is like Bradley's

immediate experience which is fleeting. It unifies all values and organizes all experiences of life. It is only true destiny of life. It is the heart of integral experience. Other intuitions draw their essence from it.

Radhakrishnan's mysticism is not based on miraculous ideas opposed to scientific and rationalistic beliefs. Integral experience is the fullness of mystical intuition, reason and feeling. In this stage of experience the self realizes its identity with the ultimate reality. Radhakrishnan uses the term 'Samadhi' as it carries 'a sense of immediate contact' with ultimate reality. Mystic Samadhi is presented as the ultimate, because it is 'ecstatic consciousness'.

11.8 RADHAKRISHNAN AND OTHER THINKERS

Intuition as a direct and absolute knowledge of reality is recognized by many eminent western thinkers like Plato, Descartes, Spinoza, Bradley and Bergson and also by many ancient Indian thinkers like Sankara.

Plato is a rationalistic thinker, but he adopts the concept of intuition to realize the highest 'Good'. Truth, according to him, is realized by immediate or intuitive power. Plato's dialectic method is a step in the process of realization of reality. Similarly, though Radhakrishnan regarded intuition as the final step in the apprehension of reality, it is achieved with the help of intellect.

Spinoza holds that the union with supreme reality, i.e. God, is possible only through intuition or immediate insight. Radhakrishnan agrees with Spinoza in recognizing intellect as the process that leads to intuition. Both never regarded intuition as the independent mental faculty. Along with Spinoza Radhakrishnan believes that intellectual truth is relative and demands to be transcended in intuition. Further, both of them never regarded intellectual knowledge as illusory. It is partial vision and ultimately leads us to the highest knowledge. But Radhakrishnan disagrees with Spinoza in the point that while for him intuition is attained only by some specially gifted people, for Spinoza once one knows how

to attain intuition, there is no difficulty on his part to make an application of this power. Spinoza also distinguishes imagination and reason from intuition.

Like **Hegel,** Radhakrishnan believes in the concrete spiritual ultimate Reality. But the means adopted by Hegel for knowing the ultimate reality is the dialectic exposition of intellectual process while Radhakrishnan uses intuition as the sole means that includes intellect along with other faculties of mind. Thus, Radhakrishnan does not accept the Hegelian concept of intuition which is unrelated to intellect and incapable of giving us anything else than simple being. For Him, Hegel's dialectic as an intellectual method may help us to have the concept of an Absolute Reality, but for the proper realization of the concrete spiritual reality, intuition must be presupposed by intellect. Moreover, Hegel holds that thought is identical with reality, while Radhakrishnan holds that ultimate reality is of the nature of experience.

Radhakrishnan agrees with **Bergson** in recognizing the value of intuition but he differs from Bergson on the point that unlike Bergson he does not view that intuition is the work of life force but the function of spiritual consciousness. Radhakrishnan is not anti-intellectualist like Bergson. While for Bergson intuition is radically opposed to intuition, for Radhakrishnan reason and intuition are interdependent. Therefore, Radhakrishnan says that there is a tendency in Bergson to oppose intuition to intellect. In this way, Radhakrishnan has criticized both Hegel's bias against intuition and Bergson's bias against the intellect.

Both Radhakrishnan and **Bradley** are idealistic philosophers. Bradley carries on the great Hegelian tradition while Radhakrishnan carries on the Vedantic tradition. Radhakrishnan maintains the traditional Indian character in his thought by being more practical in his approach. Thus, Radhakrishnan emphasizes on the actual realization of intuitive knowledge while Bradley does on speculative possibility. Moreover Radhakrishnan maintains continuity between thought and intuition, but Bradley says that thought 'commits suicide' in absolute experience.

Radhakrishnan shares with the view of Kant's intuitive certainties. But he differs from Kant on the point that Kant restricts intuitive certainties only to the underived moral consciousness, while Radhakrishnan extends it to all fields of human experience.

Radhakrishana's concept off intuition as 'integral experience' is akin to **Sankara**'s concept of 'Anubhava'. Of course, unlike Sankara, Radhakrishnan does not negate reason though intuition transcends reason. By AnubhavaSankara means the realization of one's self as Brahman. Sankara believes that 'tarka' or reasoning is a step in the direction of self- realization but with the rise of Brahman it disappears for ever. But Radhakrishnan does not totally reject intellect; rather in his integral experience of intuitive realization he puts intellect in its due place.



ACTIVITY:11.1

Do you find any relationship between epistemology and metaphysics in Radhakrishnan's philosophy?

Ans......

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

11.9 INTELLECT AND INTUITION

Intuition is qualitatively different from logical thought, though not discontinuous with it. Intuition depends on intellect and also transcends it. They belong to the same principle i.e. the self. Intuitive knowledge transcends the partial truth of the intellect. Intellect and intuition are not two opposed methods of grasping reality. At the root of human mind, there is no conflict between reason and intuition. Intuition which ignores

intellect is useless. That Radhakrishnan did not consider intuition to be opposed to intellect can be elaborated by stressing the following points.

- Intuition goes beyond intellect or reason. It does not enter into any conflict with reason or intellect. On the otherhand, it overcomes or surpasses intellect.
- In the opinion of Radhakrishnan intuition is the response of the whole man to reality. On the otherhand, what we get in the intellect is a partial response to the reality. Because intuition is the response of the whole man to reality so it involves intellect also. Thus there is no opposition between intellect and intuition. One supplements the other.
- According to Radhakrishnan intuition is not independent but emphatically dependent upon thought. Intuition is immanent to the very nature of our intellect.
- Intuition and intellect belong to the same principle i.e. the self. So they are not contradictory to each other.

Radhakrishnan does not take intellect and intuition as constituting any kind of polarity. Intuition fulfills intellect and does not negate it. Intuition is the very basis of the intellect. It is the highest dimension of consciousness free from all antinomies inherent in reason. Intuition is not irrational and intellect is not opposed to it. Intuition is not against reason but it is beyond reason. Thus, intellect has not been discarded, but has been so thoroughly subordinated to intuition that it is preserved as a function of intuition. In relation to the intellect, intuition stands as a whole to a part. Both have their own rights. Each is useful. Each has its own specific purpose. Both belong to the self. But, intellect involves a specialized part and intuition employs the whole self. Both intellect and intuition are interdependent.

Again, the immediacy of intuitive knowledge can be mediated through intellectual definition and analysis. Intellect is used to test the validity of intuition and to communicate it to others.

Bergson and Bradley have often been accused as anti-intellectualists. But intuition, as Radhakrishnan conceives is not antagonistic to the intellect. As he says, “Intuition which ignores intellect is useless. The two are not only non incompatible but vitally united.”



ACTIVITY:11.2

Do you find any relationship between intellect and intuition? Discuss

Ans. .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 9:What according to Radhakrishnan are the limitations of intellect inthe apprehension of reality?

.....

.....

Q 12: What does Radhakrishnan mean by intuition? Briefly explain (Answer in about 100 words)

.....

.....

Q 13: Is intuition opposed to intellect? Explain in brief with reference to Radhakrishnan (Answer in about 130 words)

.....

.....

Q 14: How can Radhakrishnan's views of intellect and intuition be compared with the views of some other philosophers? (Answer in about 150 words)

.....

.....



11.10 LET US SUM UP

- According to Radhakrishnan there are three different ways of knowing: sense-experience, discursive reasoning, and intuitive apprehension.
- Sense-experience is the way through which we are acquainted with the sensible qualities of the objects.
- Logical knowledge is obtained by discursive reasoning through the process of analysis and synthesis of the perceived data. It is indirect as it depends upon perception. It is symbolic in its character. Both sense-knowledge and logical knowledge are limited. Both are inadequate to apprehend the reality.
- Intuitive knowledge is non-sensuous, immediate knowledge. Intuitive knowledge is knowledge by being.
- Radhakrishnan has shown the limitations of intellect. According to him, intuition cannot be regarded as an independent method in the apprehension of reality. It can never overcome the dichotomy of subject-object relation.
- Intuition is qualitatively different from logical thought, though not discontinuous with it. Intuition depends on intellect and also transcends it. They belong to the same principle i.e. the self.
- Intellect and intuition are not two opposed methods of grasping reality. In relation to the intellect, intuition stands as a whole to a part. Both intellect and intuition are interdependent.
- Idealism, intuitionism and mysticism are the three elements out of which Radhakrishnan constructs his epistemology. Thus, Radhakrishnan weaves a new method of knowledge that may be designated by the phrase ‘integral experience’.



11.11 FURTHER READING

Radhakrishnan, S., An Idealist View of Life, Unwin Paperbacks, London,1980

Arapura, J.G., Radhakrishnan and Integral Experience, Asia Publishing House, New York,

Radhakrishnan, S., Indian philosophy, Vol-1 & Vol-2, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London, Humanities Press, Inc. New York, 1977

Radhakrishnan, S., Recovery of Faith, Harper Collins Publishers, India, 1994

Radhakrishnan, S., and Muirhead, J.H., Contemporary Indian Philosophy, S. Chand. & Co. Ltd., New York, 1982

Datta, D.M.,The Chief Currents of Contemporary Philosophy, The University of Calcutta, 1961



11.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans. to Q No 1: According to Radhakrishnan there are three ways of knowing reality.They are: sense experience, discursive reasoning, and intuitive apprehension.

Ans. to Q No 2: Sense –experience is the way of knowing reality that gives us the knowledge of the sensible qualities of the external world.

Ans. to Q No 3: Discursive reasoning or logical reasoning is the way of knowing reality that gives us the knowledge of both the external and the internal but in an indirect way through concepts and symbols.

Ans. to Q No 4: Intuitive knowledge is non-sensuous and immediate knowledge. Intuitive knowledge is knowledge by being. The essence of reality is apprehended only in intuition.

Ans. to Q No 5: No

Ans. to Q No 6: No

Ans to Q No 7: Literally intuition means to 'look at' or the direct vision or immediate awareness of something.

Ans to Q No 8: a) False b) True c) True d) True

Ans to Q No 9: Radhakrishnan has shown the limitations of intellect in the following way.

- Intellect is concerned with the appearance of reality. It fails to give a unified knowledge.
- According to Radhakrishnan reality is dynamic, which can not be touched by intellect.
- Intellect is always dichotomous. It can never overcome the dichotomy of subject-object relation.
- It refers only to symbolic knowledge.
- As intellect is of temporal process; it is limited and finite. It is subject to correction.
- Intellectual knowledge is possible only when the data are supplied from somewhere else. But there are some aspects of reality of which the sense cannot supply their data, e.g. the emotion of anger, because before intellect can analyze the mood of anger, we must get at it. However, Radhakrishnan is not an anti-intellectualist. He has only shown the limitation of intellect

Ans to Q No 10: Literally 'intuition' means to 'look at' or the direct vision or immediate awareness of something. Intuition is termed as 'Aparoksha' by the Indianphilosophers.In such knowledge the knower and known are one. Here, to know realityis to be reality. The knowledge of the self is the best example of the intuitive apprehension.According to Radhakrishnan, intuitive knowledge is non-sensuous and immediate. Intuitive knowledge is subjective, intimately personal; but it is notlimited by its scope.Intuition depends on intellect and also transcends it. Intuition is all comprehensive. Intuition is neither supernatural nor opposed to reasonAs a means of knowing, intuition is distinguished from imagination,instinct and from a mystic process. Intuition, as revealing the whole spirit, is regarded by Radhakrishnan as the integral whole.

Ans to Q No 11: According to him, intuition and intellect are not opposed to each other. Intuition depends on intellect and also transcends it. They belong to the same Principle i.e. the self. Intuitive knowledge transcends the partial truth of the intellect. At the root of human mind, there is no conflict between reason and intuition. Intuition which ignores intellect is useless. In the opinion of Radhakrishnan intuition is the response of the whole manto reality, so it involves intellect also. According to Radhakrishnan, intuition is not independent but emphatically dependent upon thought. Intuition fulfills intellect and does not negate it. Each has its own specific purpose. Both belong to the self. But, intellect involves a specialized part of the self and intuition employs the whole self. Both intellect and intuition are interdependent.

Ans to Q No 12: Radhakrishnan is influenced by both Western and Indian thinkers. But he has reconstructed, remodified and reinterpreted their views according to his ownway. Like Plato's dialectic method which is a step to realize the truth, Radhakrishnan regarded intuition as the final step in the apprehension of reality; it is achieved with the help of intellect.

With Spinoza Radhakrishnan believes that intuition is not the independent mental faculty. Like **Hegel,** Radhakrishnan believes in concrete spiritual ultimate Reality. But Radhakrishnan does not accept the Hegelian concept of intuition which is unrelated to intellect and incapable of giving us anything else than simple being. Radhakrishnan, unlike Bergson, views that intuition is the work of life force but the function of spiritual consciousness. Radhakrishnan is notanti-intellectualist like Bergson. Both Radhakrishnan and **Bradley** are idealistic philosophers. Radhakrishnan maintains continuity between thought and intuition, but Bradley says that thought 'commits suicide' in absolute experience. Unlike Sankara, Radhakrishnan does not negate reason though intuition transcends reason. Rather Radhakrishnan

in his integral experience of intuitive realization puts intellect in its due place.



11.13 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Objective questions

Q 1: What are the different ways of knowing?

Q 2: State the literal meaning of intuition.

Q 3: What do you mean by sense experience?

Q 4: What is discursive reasoning?

Q 5: What is intuition?

Q 6: What are the kinds of intuition?

Q 7: Radhakrishnan is not an anti-intellectualist. Is it a correct statement?

Q 8: 'Thought commits suicide'. Who says this statement?

Q 9: Write the names of two anti-intellectualists.

B) Short Questions(Answer each question in about 150 words)

Q 1: What is the role of intellect in the apprehension of Reality, according to Radhakrishnan? Briefly explain

Q 2: Write short notes on: (a) Sense-perception

(b) Intellect (c) Intuition (d) Integral experience

Q 3: Distinguish between sense perception and intuition.

Q 4: Distinguish between Intellect and intuition.

Q 5: Briefly point out the nature of intuition.

Q 6: Explain in brief the relationship between intellect and intuition.

D) Long Questions (Answer each question in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Describe Radhakrishnan's concept of intuition and intellect.

Q 2: Is intuition opposed to intellect? Discuss with reference to Radhakrishnan's view.

Q 3: What does Radhakrishnan mean by intuition? Is he anti-intellectualist? Discuss.

Q 4: How does Radhakrishnan criticize intellect? Explain

Q 5: Describe the relation between intellect and intuition, according to Radhakrishnan.

** *** **