

ON

PHILOSOPHY OF SRIMAD RAJCHANDRA

CHAPTER I

SRIMAD RAJCHANDRA'S APPROACH

INTRODUCTION

Dante proclaimed: "There is not one goal for this civilization and one for that, but for the civilization of all mankind there is a single goal." This craving for the common goal is not of men but of man, of human heart, of humanity split up in fragments at various national camps and creeds.

But, from where can we have the glimpse of that goal, whereby one and all from lowest to the highest rise from slumber and lethargy, develop their potentialities and find impetus in their progress leading to perfection. Where can we have such a wisdom that may lead us all to the light? What is it that gives meaning to the glories of science, to grandeur of technology and to grace of art and literature? What is it that makes all those riches of the world really rich? What is it that brings them in their true colours? 'Philosophy alone', is the only answer. Why not Science? Science as knowledge is a great power, indeed. But for man, "In so far as he is wise this new power is beneficent, in so far as he is foolish it is quite the reverse. If, therefore, a scientific civilisation is to be a good civilisation it is necessary that increase of knowledge should be accompanied by increase in wisdom. I mean by wisdom right conception of the ends of life. This is something which science in itself does not provide."¹

1. Bertrand Russell: The Scientific Outlook: Introduction.

But how can philosophy meet this demand ? What enables it to provide this wisdom, this light, this spirit - this universal requirement ? It is its vision of ultimate reality, the vision of the Good - Bliss.

Philosophy may perhaps mend the matters and can end the troubles. But how can such philosophy be a possibility on earth where philosophers differ among themselves ? Every philosopher claims his findings to be final, his system the sole truth and his goal as ultimate. It may be so with philosophers, but not so with master philosophers. Though their ways and vision may slightly differ in degrees, but they arrive at the same conclusion in general. It is proverbial that thousand wise, one and all, will have the same opinion; while one unwise will have thousand opinions.

Though such masters are rare, they happen to be on earth when they are needed most - at the critical time that threatens great civilisations. At the encounter of Western Civilisation during the era of the British rule, India rose up from lethargy and came to realise her glorious heritage. Then she tried to rise up as one nation not only for her independence but for re-articulating her own civilisation and culture in the light of her glorious past. It is really the epoch of national awakening. There flourished the team of greatmen like Vivekanand, Tagore, Gandhiji, Arvind Ghosh and Nehru and roused the whole nation from the slumber of slavery and ignorance. There were masters in the background as the source of inspiration and undaunted spirit like Bankimchandra Chatterjee and Sri Aurobindo Ghosh. When Gandhi was Gandhi, and not Bapu, but merely H.K. Gandhi, groping in the dark in search of religion and its truth, it was Sri Aurobindo Ghosh whose able guidance led him to the path of religion. Gandhiji has expressed in his autobiography his indebtedness to Sri Aurobindo's intense living touch and teachings.

resulting in deepest influence in his making. Gandhiji's greatness lies in his faith and following of the principle of non-violence, which he received from Srimead. Bapuji while giving account of his memories of Srimead Rajchandra once declared: "Often having told, I have also written that I have grasped many a thing from the lives of many, but the most of them all that I have grasped is from the life of Srimead, Kaviashree. Even the spirit of non-violence I have imbibed from his life..... Even if the murderer should flow love from our heart - it is Kaviashree who has taught me such a religion of grace and mercy, and I have drunk it to the full, the brimming bowl of the spirit of compassion from him I have always felt that his writings are overflowing with truth." ¹

At another occasion he writes: "This man in the matter of religion won over my heart and until now no man has laid on my heart such a great influence as his.

I have said at another place that there is a share of Ruskin and Tolstoy also as of Kavi in the formation of my inner life; but the influence of Kavi on me is far deeper, because I was in his intense direct contact and company The fundamental basis of Kavi's principle was undoubtedly 'Ahimsa' (non-violence). ^{all} The field of Kavi's 'Ahimsa' comprised within it/ from the finest insect to the whole of mankind." ² "To him the whole world was just his kith and kin." ³

So we realize his non-violence was not negative, nor was it limited. It was in its positive sense love for all the beings, all the souls of the universe. It was not merely a belief or a passing gesture, it was his conviction, his life, resulted from the vision of all-pervading ultimate reality at the basis of the whole of the

1. Srimead Rajchandra's Artha-Katabdi Sanrak Grantha. p.8.

2 + 3 , Ibid, p.9.

universe. He wrote plainly: "Do not forget that I am not in any religious sect, I am only within the Self." (S.R. p.170). "I observe all the religions." (S.R. p.159). Such a master philosopher can lead us safe from the strife of religions and philosophies to religion, to philosophy proper, wherein all the rest find their proper place and import. In his treatise on Self-realisation he writes while concluding: "All the six systems are comprised within these six principles, thinking explicitly over it all doubts disappear and there shall remain no occasion for any doubt as such." (A.S. 128). He writes in the same book that "the final conclusions arrived at by all the enlightened find their fulfillment there." (A.S.116).

It is because, as we have observed before, the Masters have vision of the ultimate reality, that they have a key to the solution of all fundamental problems of philosophy. And it is with such a faith, great philosophers of East and West of past and present have set themselves to the search of something ultimate. A bird's eye-view, of the history of philosophy will convince us of this fact.

Grind writes about the ultimate reality: "There must be some 'adhisthāna' of the universe, is the say of the most of the seers; and we (I) too say the same that there is the 'adhisthāna'....." (S.R.p.274). "Adhisthāna means from where the thing rises, wherein it maintains its being - and wherein it is finally resolved. Take the adhisthāna (ground) of the universe in sense of that definition." (S.R.p.275).

Dr.Radhakrishnan rightly observes: "The Upanishads ask, 'What is the 'tajjalan' from which all things spring, into which they are resolved and in which they live and have their being." ¹ e.g. in the Taittiriya Upanishad Yama advised

1. The Principal Upanishads, p.54.

his son Bhrgu: "That verily from which these beings are born, that by which, when he
born they live, that into which, when departing, they enter. That seek to know.

That is Brahman." ¹ Shankara bases his Philosophy in the Brahma Sutra on this
fundamental principle, the Ultimate Reality, the beginning and end of the
philosophical search.

Now let us turn to the Western philosophers and try to understand what is the real
main object of the philosophic search.

Words flow from springs of life and their meanings are expressive of their
manifestations. Life is not static; it is dynamic, overflowing and fresh. It
changes with the times. So the words gain various shades of meaning, while passing
from age to age. Yet they generally retain some vital and basic elements of the
concept throughout their usage, whatever the age.

In the time of Socrates the Sophists were puzzled about the nature of truth and it
they concluded that knowledge was unattainable as the meanings of words differed
with different thinkers and therefore there was nothing like Truth, as opinions
differed. But Socrates was bent upon the search of some fundamental ^{agreement} / some common
ground, some principle as the basis. Hence it will be worthwhile for us to have
such an approach regarding the meaning of the word philosophy so as to arrive at
some comprehensive concept of philosophy.

According to Plato, Socrates called philosopher, a lover of wisdom, ^{the} of/whole
of wisdom. Socrates says: "a lover, if he is worthy of the name, ought to show

1. Dr. Radhakrishnan: The Principal Upanishads, p.555.

his love, not to some one part of that which he loves, but to the whole."¹

"And may we not say of the philosopher that he is a lover not of a part² of wisdom only, but of the whole?"

But who really are the lovers of wisdom? ".... those who love the truth in each thing are to be called lovers of wisdom"³

"Who then are the true philosophers?"

"Those" who are lovers of the vision of truth."⁴

Hence, philosophy is 'love of wisdom' as a 'whole' which (wisdom) dwells on obtaining 'the vision of truth', 'the truth in each thing', the truth in everything and in all.

So true philosophers must have knowledge of the truth in each and every thing. For Socrates, "Being is the sphere or subject-matter of knowledge, and knowledge is to know the nature of being."⁵ But the matter does not end here i.e. with the being. He leads us further: "You will agree that the Sun not only makes the things we see visible but also brings them into existence, and gives them growth and nourishment; yet he is not the same thing as existence. And so with the object of knowledge: these derive from the good not only their power of being known, but their being and reality;"⁶

1. Reginald F. O'Neill S.J.: Readings in Epistemology, p.5.

2. Ibid. 3. Ibid., p.10 4. Ibid., p.6.

5. Ibid., p.8

6. Cornford: The Republic of Plato, p.215.

Thus he leads us finally to the good, the source of all, something as ultimate reality in his opinion, rather according to his knowledge, may, wisdom, which becomes the basis for the wisdom of the West.

For Plato, in the words of Frank Thilly, "Philosophy has for its aim knowledge of the universal, unchangeable and eternal reality behind the particular and transitory appearances of sense."¹ In 'the Republic', Plato writes: ".... the Philosophers are those who can apprehend the eternal and unchanging, while those who cannot do so, but are lost in the mazes of multiplicity and change, are not philosophers....."² ".....those who see the absolute and eternal and immutable may be said to know....."³ Thus the philosopher sees beyond change and multiplicity, beyond the world of 'becoming', really the 'being', the ultimate principle of reality.

Turning to Aristotle's Metaphysics, we find similar views. Regarding philosophy he writes: "It is right also that philosophy should be called knowledge of the truth. For the end of theoretical knowledge is truth, while that of practical knowledge is action (for even if they consider how things are, practical men do not study the eternal, but what is relative and in the present)."⁴

....."that which causes derivative truths to be true, is most true, Hence, the principles of eternal things must be always most true, (for they are not merely sometimes true,⁵ nor is there any cause of their being, but they themselves are the cause of being of other things), so that as each thing is in respect of being, so is it in respect of truth."

1. A History of Philosophy, p.61.

2. Cornford: The Republic of Plato, p.105.

3. Reginald F. O'Neill: Readings in Epistemology, p.10. 4. Ibid, p.52.

5. Ibid, p.52.

Thus the main characteristic of wisdom, and hence that of philosophy, is "to deal with the first causes and the principles of things". In the words of Bradley, "metaphysics is an attempt to know reality as against mere appearance, or the study of first principles or ultimate truths, or the effort to comprehend the universe, not simply piecemeal or by fragments, but somehow as a whole."

The whole Christian Era has the tendency of holding God and self as the ultimate aim of knowledge. According to Augustinian view, the only knowledge worth having is the knowledge of God and self. All other Sciences are to be valued if they contribute to the knowledge of God. For St. Thomas Philosophy passes from facts to God. Francis De Sales declares "God gives the Soul an ever-increasing perceptive light, by which the understanding continues to penetrate deeper and deeper in the knowledge of its divine attraction."¹ St. Thomas Aquinas writes: ".....our intellect is led by sensibles to the divine knowledge so as to know about God that He is, and such other truths, which need to be ascribed to the first principle. Accordingly some divine truths are attainable by human reason, while others altogether surpass human reason."²

Leo-Tse expresses his realization of the First Cause, the ultimate reality: "The great everlasting- infinite First Cause can neither be defined nor named." "Something exists which is incomprehensible, which is perfect, and which existed before heaven and earth were.... Its name none I know not, but I call it Tao. Were I to give it yet another name, I should call it the Great."³

-
1. Douglas Clyde Macintosh: The Problem of Religious Knowledge.
 2. Kirkorian: Basic Problems of Philosophy, p.412.
 3. Ibid, p.404.

Rosen assigns to metaphysics two functions: "to discover the eternal and ¹ immutable forms of bodies, and to discuss purposes, ends or final causes."

Philosophy, according to Hobbes, is a knowledge of effects from their causes and causes from their effects,...." "The problem, therefore, is to find a first principle, a starting point for our reasoning, a cause on which to ground all ² effects."

In Descartes' opinion, "Philosophy is a perfect knowledge of all that man can know, as well for the conduct of his life....." ³ His problem was to find out some principle, certain and self-evident so that it may serve a starting point for metaphysics. He wrote: "Archimedes, that he might transport the entire globe from the place it occupied to another, demanded only a point that was firm and immovable; so also I should be entitled to establish the highest expectations, if I am fortunate enough to discover only one thing that is certain and indubitable." ⁴ He believed that by the help of the self-evident concepts and principles a system of metaphysics could be built.

Spinoza too adopts the same method and tries to prove that "everything is said to follow from the first principle or ground of the universe, as necessarily as the propositions of geometry follow from their logical propositions." ⁵ He writes: "... the love towards a thing eternal and infinite alone fills the mind with a pleasure secure from all pain.... The greatest good is the knowledge of the union which the mind has with the whole of nature." ⁶ This gives a glimpse of his philosophical approach.

1. Frank Thilly: A History of Philosophy, p.290.

2. Ibid, p.294. 3. Ibid, p.302. 4x

4. Reginald O'Neill, Readings in Epistemology, p.77

5. Frank Thilly: A History of Philosophy, p.321 6. Will Durant, The Story of Philosophy, p.166;

In Berkeley's opinion, "The whole creation is the workmanship of a wise and good Agent, and the philosophers should concern themselves solely with the final causes of things; they should try to discover the various ends to which things are adapted, and for which they are originally contrived."¹ In his view "there is no other agent or efficient cause than spirit."² He believes, thus, at the basis of all, something ultimate as 'efficient cause' or 'final cause', which should be the object of philosophical search.

Even Hume realized a purpose, an intention and design evident in everything, and when our comprehension is so far enlarged as to contemplate the first rise of the visible system, we must adopt with the strongest conviction the idea of some intelligent cause or another.³

Leibniz writes in the Principles of Nature and Grace: "now we must advance to metaphysics, making use of the great principle, that nothing happens without a sufficient reason....."

"Now, this sufficient reason for the existence of the universe cannot be found in the series of contingent things,..... Thus it must be that sufficient reason which had no need of another reason, be outside this series of contingent things and be found in a substance which is its cause, or which is a necessary being, carrying the reason of its existence within itself. Otherwise we should still not have a sufficient reason, in which we could rest."⁴ Thus, metaphysics, in order to have its structure real and complete, needs something ultimately real at the basis.

1.-2. Frank Shilly: A History of Philosophy, p.336.

3. Ibid, p.380.

4. Walter Kaufmann: Philosophic Classics, p. 256.

In the words of Leibniz....., if there is reality in essences or possibilities or indeed in the eternal truths, this reality must be founded in something existing and actual, and consequently in the existence of the necessary being....¹

"Reason also tries" as does Kant observe, "to reduce the objective conditions of all our phenomena to an ultimate and supreme condition, or an unconditioned. We form the idea of nature as a whole, the idea of a Universe and either conceive this as the principle on which all phenomena depend, or seek the unconditioned among the phenomena themselves."²

Thus we have^a tendency to find something ultimate, but no phenomenon can be the cause of phenomena, hence Kant provides the noumenon. "We can regard the phenomena as cause by the thing-in-itself, the noumenal cause which is not perceived and arranged in an unbroken causal series."³

To Fichte philosophy is a queen science. "indeed, philosophy is Wissenschaftslehre." "The different sciences call for an all embracing science, a science of sciences, a Wissenschaftslehre, which shall establish or prove the basic principle on which every one of them rests. And this universal science or philosophy, the source of the certainty of all the others, must itself proceed from a self-evident or necessary proposition, from an absolute first principle that shall give its own judgement their scientific character while at the same time, validating those of all the other fields of research."⁴ Indeed a quite reasonable insistence for the ultimate principle, and for the right mission of philosophy.

1. The Monadology, 44.

2. Frank Thilly: A History of Philosophy, p.431 3. Ibid, pp.433-34.

4. Ibid, pp.433-34.

In Hegel's opinion,¹ "The function of the mind and the task of philosophy, is to discover the unity that lies potential in diversity.... The task of religion is to reach and feel the Absolute in which all the opposites are resolved into unity, that great sum of being in which matter and mind, subject and object, good and evil are one..... In man the Absolute rises to self-consciousness, and becomes the Absolute Idea - that is, thought realising itself as part of the Absolute, the hidden harmony of all things. So the absolute is the ultimate reality to be realised in Absolute Idea through philosophy and religion. In Phenomenology he writes plainly: "The spiritual alone is the real."²

Schopenhauer writes: "I hold this thought - that the world is will - to be that which has been sought for under the name of philosophy."

Let us turn to scientists and evolutionists. Spencer writes:³ "...philosophy is a completely unified knowledge." "An ever-present sense of real existence is the very basis of our intelligence. There ever remains with us a sense of that which exists persistently and independently of the special conditions of our knowledge.

We cannot form a conception of this absolute existence....."⁴ "The Absolute, the First Cause, the Infinite cannot be known,.... We can, however, always relate things to an Absolute; indeed, we must have an Absolute to which to relate them. A relative is itself inconceivable except as related to a real non-relative - the relative presupposes an Absolute."⁵ We are limited in our knowledge to the relative phenomena, to the inner and outer expressions of the Absolute. It is our business as philosophers to discover the traits common to all phenomena, or to find the universal law of things.⁶

1. Will Durant: The Story of Philosophy, p.296. 2. Ibid, p.309. 3. Ibid, p.366

4. Frank Thilly: A History of Philosophy, p.554.

5. Ibid, p.547 6. Ibid, p.550.

According to Bergson: ".....philosophy is and must remain a direct vision of reality, a *Weltanschauung*..., an intuition.Philosophy is the art of comprehending or seizing the universe in its process, in its vital impetus."¹

Russell writes: "Philosophy, like all other studies, aims primarily at knowledge. The knowledge, it aims at, is the kind of knowledge, which gives unity and system to the body of the sciences, and the kind, which results from a critical examination of the grounds of our conditions, prejudices, and beliefs."

"The free intellect will see as God might see....."²

Whitehead expresses his views on philosophy in his pragmatic style: "The pursuit of philosophy is the one avocation denied to omniscience." ".....philosophy is mystical. For mysticism is direct insight into depths as yet unspoken. But the purpose of philosophy is to rationalise mysticism."³

In Dewey's view ".... reality is in the making" and "Mind is no longer a spectator beholding the world from without The mind is within the world as a part of latter's own on-going process."⁴ While writing on Philosophy and the Education of Man he observes: "Philosophy has generally been defined in ways which imply a certain totality, generality and ultimateness of both subject-matter and method."⁵

Joseph Ratnesu rightly concludes: "What is the common ultimate destination of modern science and philosophy? To say it is the Truth is too vague to lead us anywhere. But to say it is the eternal and immutable Reality leads us straight home into the theoretical heart of modern science and philosophy and back to the bosom of the Greeks."⁶

1. Ibid, p.616 2. Problems of Philosophy: The Value of Philosophy

3. Modes of Thought. 4. Reginald F.O'Neill: Readings in Epistemology, p.211

5. Democracy and Education, p.378. 6. Intelligence in the Modern World. Intro.p.27.

Stevenson too observes: "Philosophers often seek not reality, but Reality,
 or rather true Reality."¹ i.e. that stands ultimately real.

Prof. P. T. Raju while explaining the realistic element in Sankar's idealism
 writes: "Philosophical enquiry arises only because the finite is not ultimately
 real...."² We agree that because finite things are not self-existent, they point
 beyond themselves to something which is self-existent...."³ i.e. ultimately real.

Thus having observed the main general concept of philosophy and the
 direction of philosophical enquiry in the main, let us turn to Orinad's approach.

1. Facts and Values, p.41.

2. Thought and Reality p.187.

3. Ibid p.186.

SRIHAD RAJCHANDRA'S APPROACH

"Egam Janai Se Govana Janai "

A philosopher then, if true to his motto, sees life steadily and sees it whole. He is of no particular time and clime. He is above all distinctions of age and race. Plato has rightly stated that the philosopher is the spectator of all time and all existence, and that he is one, who sets his affection on the whole reality. Not only that he is conscious of the whole of reality, but also he has what W.M. Urban calls a specially developed sense for the totality of things. Therein lies his greatness as a seer. "The spirit of philosophy at its fullest is the spirit of wholeness."¹ Genuine philosophers always have something of such a spirit within. Srinad Rajchandra from the very beginning of his philosophical search shows such a bent of mind, as if he is determined to have the grasp of the whole of reality. At the outset, he makes it a point - "Final decision should be arrived at."² and instantly writes, as if assured by faith and insight, "Final decision of all kinds (of life's problems) lies in philosophy."³ Elsewhere in a picturesque style he writes: "At first Mahaveer Baa gripped in a fist the time trio and thus saw the universe."⁴ Here we have a hint, that Srinad believes in having the omniscient view of the universe, of the whole reality. And for the omniscience, he affirms that "where there is complete abolition of the vices like attachment and hatred, there, in fact, works up a principle of immediate rise of perfect innate cognitiveness (omniscience)."⁵ Thus, in his

1 R.L. Alfred Kierke. 2. Srinad Rajchandra, p.13/6.

3. Ibid, * 4. Ibid, p.232/156

5. Ibid, p.309.

opinion, omniscience to the human being is not a matter of make-believe or blind faith, but a concrete fact. It is not a gift or a lift, but it is an achievement on his part, a potential power to be developed. For, he writes, "The knowledge by which Mahavser has seen this universe lies potentially in all the souls, but it should be duly developed."¹

Knowledge of the totality or omniscience difficult

But how can one be able to have an omniscient view of the universe ? Great thinkers have confessed that the known is so little that when compared to the unknown it is no more than a drop before the vast ocean of the unknown, and yet the human knowledge acquired by intelligence is so vast and deep that it is beyond the grasp of any individual in his so short a life-time. Then what to talk of the omniscient view ?

Key to Omniscience

Is there any sure key to it. Is there anything, "which being known everything else becomes known ? "² Yes, Sriyad shows it : "Ohi the soul-seeker, on knowing the self alone, thou shalt know the whole of the universe and all, and the fruit of knowing one and all is ultimately self-realisation; therefore let thyself be withdrawn and retired from the oft-repeated wish of knowing things other than the self, and to thine own selfhood alone pay thy attention, so that by that very attention, the whole universe shall be naturally seen within thyself as an object of knowledge. The enlightened philosophers have said that this is the very essence of ^{the} path laid in the essentially metaphysical scriptures; but it is difficult to be grasped with due regard. That path is different and also its form

1. Ibid. p.158.

2. Mundaka Upanisad . I.1.3,

is different, not such as merely the lipwise say; therefore, why approach here and there and ask for it ? For, that meaning of unique essence cannot be had from everywhere." ¹ Thus with the full force of an enlightened authority, he interprets and insists on the doctrine - "Egam Jñāni sa sarvam Jñāni," ² he who knows the one (the self) knows all, - of the perennial Philosophy; and leaves the gates of omniscience open to the true seeker of the self.

Prof. H. K. Bhattacharya writes that "six orthodox systems of Indian philosophy may be said to represent the three ascending orders of human thought, viz., realistic, psychological and spiritualistic or idealistic." ³ Here, in Śrinad's interpretation of the doctrine we find ^{the} thought ^{as such} in its essence and application. So far objective reality of the universe as well as the self is accepted, it is realistic; as for the achievement of omniscience one has to undergo mental discipline, a sort of spiritual Yoga, it is psychological; and thereby maintaining the predominance of the self, as one achieves the self-perfection, the ideal and unique state above the world of delusion, it is idealistic.

The Key Doctrine justified from various aspects of Philosophy

If philosophy should embrace the whole of reality, or is rather a pursuit for a "total view of reality" at its best for an omniscient view of the universe, and if the above-stated doctrine should turn out a key to it, then the doctrine must have some essential bearing on the different branches of philosophy and must have some special significance and proper justification from the different aspects

1. S.R.p.402 /651

2. The Tīnāṅga Sūtra, 53, Aśvārāṅga 1-3-4-122.

3. Principles of Philosophy: Introduction, pp.10-11

of philosophy. Otherwise, though it may sound reasonable it is sure to fall flat on the modern mind, or, at the best, it may serve as a hint in the "trial and error" pursuit without plan to the daring explorer of the field. But modern mind is too critical to accept it by itself straight as it is.

Key-position of Knowledge

As the doctrine is mainly of knowledge of all reality, we shall limit the problem to knowledge with reference to reality and shall seek justification for it from different aspects of philosophy. Philosophy is a pursuit of knowing the reality. 'Tatvajñana' means knowledge of reality. It is an apprehension of reality. Though in a sense knowledge itself is a reality, here we have to take the rest of reality, an object of knowledge, as reality. Knowledge by its very nature is self-transcendent and therefore it can have an immediate approach and access to reality, and it can thereby apprehend the reality as it is. Thus knowledge is in a key position, and in the philosophic search and solution the initiative rests with it.

various

In its approach to reality in search of truth knowledge faces/realms and forms of reality and so knowledge takes various forms such as sentient, empirical, rational, intuitive, spiritual and the like. But in all these forms and situations there is the knower to cognize through senses, experience, reason, intuition and the self. In all the forms and situations the knower is there first and foremost.

The knower and various approaches

So far we have seen of the initiative and approach on the part of the knower through its knowing activity. Now let us see what are various possible approaches. Prof. Javadekar sums up different possible approaches to reality: "The possible approaches to reality may be summed ^{up} as follows: cognitive, logical or rational

approach; affective, aesthetical, emotional, religious, devotional or mystical approach; conative, voluntaristic or ethical approach; imaginative, poetic or artistic approach; psychological and epistemological, subjective and objective, individual and social approach."¹ All these approaches demand the knower to act and initiate; so whatever approach to reality one takes, the knower is there over and everywhere to know and experience the reality.

How can the Idealist's demand be well-met ?

Now let us see how this knower meets the demands of reality. There are two main theories of reality, the idealistic and the realistic. Dr. P. T. Raju puts up the idealistic basis very judiciously with a hint to the Western idealism :

"The business of the idealist is to get the idea of a reality which can do justice to every aspect of our experience and therefore which is all comprehensive. It is an ideal to be realised and certainly can be realised."² What is that idea ?

Let us examine the statement. It is presumed that there is reality and that as a philosopher it is an idealistic task to know it and thereby have an idea of it and that it should be based on experience; for, knowledge in a sense is a rationalised experience, revealing the reality. But as every aspect of experience, refers to reality and reveals reality from different angles, we must have, in order to do justice to every aspect of experience, an idea of all-comprehensive reality, philosophy being knowledge of reality as a whole.

So, how can the idealist have an idea of all-comprehensive reality, or how he gets it ? Surely it must be based on infallible experience, experience being

1. Approach to Reality, p.11.

2. Idealistic Thought of India, p.64.

reality-revealing. Every experience has atleast a double reference, one to the experiencing self within, and the other to the experienced thing without. So Dr. Radhakrishnan rightly observes: "The Indian has felt that the inner spirit of man is the most significant clue to his reality and to that of the universe, more significant by far than the physical or the external." So we must turn to the knower, the self. Keeping aside the metaphysical problem, whether the self and the reality are one or separate, let us approach it from only epistemological point of view. Epistemologically, knower has knowledge of the object of knowledge i.e. reality, and as we are concerned with the knowledge of reality, we must turn to the knower - the self within; and if at all reality is one with the self the better. Any how, whether it be separate or the same, we must take introspective view in our approach to reality.

Epistemological justifications

The doctrine, "He who knows the self knows all", primarily and ultimately touches the problem of all knowledge. So we should turn to epistemology for its proper justification. Philosophy is the search for the knowledge of the whole of reality. Therefore, though epistemology is one branch of philosophy, epistemological aspect must, in fact, embrace the whole of reality. And we have to assess the value and significance of that doctrine from this particular point of view.

Predominance of the knower:

Speaking epistemologically the knower (*jñātā*), knowledge (*jñāna*) and the object of knowledge (*jñeya*) comprise everything in the universe

and embrace the whole of reality. Nothing remains outside the trial^d. It is all-including. Nothing escapes it. It is all-embracing. Among the three the knower naturally earns a predominant position. For, there can be no knowledge without the knower, nor can anything be known without the knower. No doubt, the knower and knowledge always go together. They cannot be separated. No knowledge, no knower; no knower, no knowledge. But they are not one and the same; they are different, though not separate. They can be distinguished, but not divided. If knowledge is an act, the knower is an agent. If knowledge is a phenomenon or a series of phenomena there must be some knower at the basis. If knowledge is a beam of light or a stream of energy the knower is the source. So the knower, call it by whatever name—mind, soul or self, is at the basis and is the source of all knowledge. In all acts of knowing through senses, mind or intuition¹, the knower is there at the basis. At all the levels of consciousness the knower is there first and foremost to initiate the act^{and}. Ignore the knower and you cannot account either for knowledge or for the known. The act of ignoring cannot be done without the knower. In fact, the knower can neither be ignored nor be doubted. To say of its ignoring or doubting is self-contradictory. Validity of knowledge about the known cannot be established without the knower. From the phenomenal point of view we may speak of knowledge as a series of momentary cognitions but for its apprehensions and intelligibility, we have to admit the knower as the basis, as an ordering and integrating agent of all knowledge. And that verily is the self, call it soul or consciousness¹ or mind in its broadest sense. R.F. Alfred Hoernle writes, "all phenomena focussed in one phenomenon, mind (in its widest sense of the term), which (alone) can apprehend itself as others, seem to me, for a synoptic view, to point to a universe."² In the words of A.N. Whitehead

1. R.N. Bhattacharya: Principles of Philosophy, p.270.

2. Contemporary British Philosophy.

"in one sense the world is in the soul."¹ So it is true to say that he who knows one (the self) knows all. Rather, it is the truth of all the truths.

Self, the source of knowledge :

Looking to the origin of knowledge, we cannot ignore the conditions rendered by reality, nor can we ignore the initiative nature of consciousness, (upayoga) of the self for the different objects of knowledge through senses or mind. Senses and mind are merely the means, rather the tools for directing the consciousness of the self, which alone has the capacity of knowing. So the source of knowledge is the self.

Different ideas provided with a right stand for their approaches to reality

Scepticism, authoritarianism, empiricism, rationalism and intuitionism lay down different theories for the origin of knowledge and advocate different approaches to reality; and if honest, and not obstinate, they lead us to the right source of all knowledge, the self.

The Scepticism

Sceptic's doubt leads one to inquiry proper and from its culminating point, the self-doubting, leads us to the ground, source and validity of all knowledge and to ultimate reality, and comes itself to the Cartesian conclusion: "If thought is to be true and valuation sound the self to which reality is related in the process of knowledge and valuation must itself be real, must have constant and permanent objective and universal essence, the same in all minds."²

1. Twentieth Century Philosophy: p.140 article on 'Philosophy of Life'.

2. McCracken D.J.: Thinking and Valuing.

Empiricism (a) Sensationalism

Empiricism from different aspects like sensationalism, phenomenism and positivism poses the situation and condition of the origin of knowledge. Sensationalism lays greater emphasis on the external side of nescient experience and makes much of sensations and feelings. But sensations and feelings have ^{reference} double reference both to the subject and the object; and from epistemological point of view one should turn to the conscious element at work in the situation of cognition. On looking towards the nature of sensations and feelings one would realise the predominance and initiative of the self in these conscious activities. Sensation is in the self and of the self, not in the object and nor of the object, though it is due to the object. Hence the self is the source of sensation, and object the cause thereof. In order to be genuine, sensationalism should take into consideration the source of sensation and not the cause of the sensation. Considering the nature of philosophic search it is a presupposition (a priori concept) that reality as an object of knowledge is passive, so sensationalism should not give undue importance to the external object, but rather, like Plato, should see the validity of knowledge as revealer of reality (jñāna-pramāṇa) and should turn to active element, the self, for complete knowledge.

Phenomenalism

Phenomenalism has rightly glimpsed the original situation of knowledge phenomenon and has well-accounted both the sides of it, one consciously and the other unconsciously. On one hand, from the objective point of view it has taken in grip the trio of time, space and matter in the very concept of phenomenon, and from the subjective point of view, of course unconsciously, of the sharp ever-^{the} recording cognitive capacity of the self. If phenomenalist is thoroughly

empirical in his search and as a philosopher true to his mettle i.e. bent upon having knowledge of the reality as a whole, on being a little bit daring with a spirit of an empiricist to go through the experiences whatever the consequences, then he can realize that the self within can have a momentary glimpse of the whole of reality. Or else he must give up trying knowing, and should accept mental nirvana. Soon shall he be thrown into nirvikalpa samadhi and will come to self-realisation where he would see the whole universe as an object of knowledge reflected in his own self and would earn an omniscient state. Or else he must remain seer (draṣṭā) of this fast changing phenomenal world and need not interfere caring neither for the existence within or without, and he will turn out a vitarāga - the non-attached and soon shall shine out his omniscience. Thus shall he come from avenues of phenomenalism proper to the omniscience constant.

Positivism

Positivism is considered another name for the phenomenalism. And so far as it remains shut within the avenues of phenomenon, it is practically the same as phenomenalism. Yet it can be said that it has its own stand and its own approach and the method. It being a type of empiricism by nature, takes phenomenon for positive experience. Its aim is to have knowledge through positive experience, and phenomenon provides it. So its interest in phenomenon is for having a positive experience. Its main concern is positive experience. And in dealing with a phenomenon the method of experimental science is the best one. But it is, as are science and technology in vogue, so much so influenced and dazzled by it that the method has possessed it heart and soul. And the result is that positivism is in practice an experimental science. Thus positivism has remained not more, in spirit, a philosophy, it merely has a claim for the name, and it has surrendered

itself wholly to the method. It works up merely as a science and professes to be a philosophy. Positivism in its approach to reality is right and earnest so far as it takes positive experience as the ground for knowledge; but it is paralysed by phenomenalism. Otherwise, positivism may yield better results, if it remains true to its motto. In its own spirit positivism would approach reality through experience and that too positive one. Phenomenon is no doubt a thing positive. It is not abstract but concrete, and more, it is actual. Yet it is an object. Every external experience has a double reference, one to the object, other to the subject. Subject is no less positive than the object. Here is no insistence on the inward experience as such but only of the subjective reference, and that too from the point of view of validity, which cannot be ignored. No experience claims a validity of knowledge on ignoring the knower, the subject; for the subject that experience^s is positively there first and foremost; and the object, be it phenomenon, event or fact, is posed there for consideration. And more significant is the fact that no experience is possible without the subject, the experiencing agent. So if the positivist care for the positive element in experience and dares an experiment, then he should not hesitate to turn to the subject, the self, positive element in every experience, atleast for the sake of having an experiment. His experience, then, would be no less experimental. Thus knowing the self first and foremost would do his 'ism' the fullest justice.

Positivism should take its stand really on the positive element in experience, which can never be negated. And this can be no other than the experiencing self, without which no experience is possible.

Experimental science won't find fault with him and call him a traitor if ^{positivist} he takes as a trial and error approach or a hypothetical pose, atleast for the

sake of an experiment. So far, from the epistemological point of view, we have tried to see empiricism as an approach to reality in its various aspects, and now let us see in general the empiricism proper. Positivism confines itself to one aspect of experience namely its positive aspect, and that too partially; while empiricism in general takes the whole of experience, and thus it has comparatively a broader basis and wider scope to embrace the reality.

Empiricism in general

Empiricism is highly judicious and practical in its approach in general to reality in so far as it makes experience a basis. Experience in general is the right approach to reality as experience reveals some one or other aspect of reality. Experience offers knowledge by direct revelation of reality. Not only that, but experience is at the root of all knowledge. All scientific and rational knowledge presupposes experience for data or a ground of validity. Generalization reached by inductive process have their grounds in brute facts rendered by common sense experience. The laws of non-contradiction and causality, of uniformity and identity ^{are} based on empirical basis of logical validity. Experience has found them in the very nature of reality. Hence, they can serve as tests of truth and basis for furtherance of knowledge of reality. Significance of empiricism lies in the self-validity character of experience. But empiricism is too narrow and partial to do justice to itself when it remains confined to sense experience alone. If it returns to its original stand of experience at large and rises to the occasion, it can realize full stature of its own. There are such realms of reality which cannot be approached by reason, and rationalism fails to account for that, at the most, it can hint at them, but can neither explore nor approach. It is experience alone that can approach and explore them thoroughly. Empiricism is availed of in some epistemological theories on the ground of its

stand of experience which is considered the source of knowledge and the basis of its validity and truth. They talk of sensations and have almost ignored inner sensations and dwell on the sense experience alone. D.J. De Craeken rightly appreciates this tendency of the empirical epistemologists and logicians: "Here the growth of reflectiveness confirms in the complete man, - Plato, Shakespeare and Spinoza may serve as examples - the primitive unity of cognition, emotion and feeling which is perhaps the only aspect of human experience about which psychologists may be said to be agreed - through epistemologists and logicians still for the most part, obstinately ignore this inseparable tripartiteness of actual experience, and continue to talk as if cognition could occur in vacuo."¹ It is in the very name of sense experience that they ignore the agent, the experiencing self, and dwell on the means, the senses. It is in the very name of epistemology that they ignore the knower and make the means and the object of knowledge everything. This is nothing else but a bias-tight obstinacy or inertia. There is no possibility of experience at all without the experiencing self with-in, it being the very basis of experience. "All experience-cognition, affection or emotion is always an experience to the 'I'. The 'I' is implicit in all awareness."² "The 'I' implicit in all knowledge is not something inferred, but something immediately lived and known by experience."³ By the very conscious nature of the self, self-awareness and self-existence go together. Self-awareness is inseparable from self-existence. So to conclude in the words of Eddington, "To treat it (consciousness) in what seems to be its obvious position as the

1. Thinking and Valuing, p.2.

2. Dr. Radhakrishnan: I.V.L. p.139

3. Ibid, p.140

avenue of approach to the reality and significance of the world, as it is the ¹ avenue of approach to all scientific knowledge of the world." Indian philosophers the great sages and the seers have realised this position and they have made self-experience the basis of all knowledge in their approach to reality. Philosophical search begins and ends in experience. Therefore Indian philosophies are based on experience and are empirical in the broadest sense of the term. Philosophy is knowledge of reality, Tattvajñana. It is a Darshana, vision of reality. It is not merely a hypothetical construction but a vision of the whole of reality through self-realisation.

Rationalism

But it does not mean that Indian philosophies are not rational. They are none the less rational than the Western ones. In their presentation and explanation they are thoroughly rational as systems. But in their basis they differ from the Western philosophies. Western philosophies are world hypotheses, they are constructs of reason. They are predominantly rational in their origin and form. But this does not mean that philosophical system should not be rational. If it is not rational it is neither a system nor a philosophy. Whatever else it may be, to be a system it must be rational first. The Empirical and the rational are not opposites but they are complementary cognitive approaches to reality and can be judiciously used according to the demands of different realms of reality.

Man in general is rational by nature. Even while taking the empirical stand in its approach to reality he is rational in maintaining the sense of propriety of the approach and giving it a recognition. Behind it works the

1. Nature of the Physical World, p.348.

vision of reality arrived at by contemplation. Thereby we find five levels of truth and reality from the logical point of view: 1. Supra logical or the level of the absolute which can be called paramārthika, 2. Speculative level, 3. Empirical level i.e. vyāvahārika, 4. The level of illusion Prātibhāsika and 5. The level of the non-existent.

Thus, supra-logical, the absolute is rationally hinted at. We can have its concept by the process of abstraction. It is realized by negative process in experience. If one goes on negating the senses and mind i.e. sense-activities and thought-activities, one would realize the self all alone in its absolute state, the thing in itself, metaphysically speaking, a pure and perfect substance, wherein shall shine out consciousness. Thus reasoning does not bring us to the absolute self but guides us by pointing to self beyond itself. Thus rationalistic approach to reality leaves us on the threshold of the realm of the spiritual or the infinite, from the relative aspect to the absolute aspect of the reality.

Thus rationalism in its attempt at a world hypothesis remains thoroughly logical and arrives at an all-comprehensive view of the reality as a whole. It is in this sense that Plato, and after him Descartes, can be justified in stating that we can have a priori knowledge of the universe as a whole and can deduce a system of universal concepts of reason.

Here we get rational justification for the existence of the supra-logical level of reality. And the fact that we can have innate ideas of categories of reality without having empirical knowledge through sense-activities reveals the nature of conscious self. As such, self is cognitively active. Cognition is its faculty, ever-active and innate at apprehending the reality. Process

of rational abstraction and process of negation lead us to self-realisation, whereby shines out the potential capacity, omniscience. The self knows everything by its self-transcending noetic (cognitive) faculty though maintaining its metaphysical absoluteness. We can realise this if we understand, firstly, difference of knowing and being from the subject-object point of view in case of knowing other things, secondly, oneness or identity of knowing and being from the view-point of self-manifesting knowledge, and thirdly, identity of knowledge known and knowing in self-realisation.

Pragmatism

Pragmatism is empirical in its basis and rational in its approach; yet in its principle of workability, it is unique and maintains a realistic stand and humanistic attitude. On principle of workability it can ordinarily be deprecated by the idealist and theoretic realist as common man's philosophy, considering its practical view point. But its principle of workability is highly significant as it has its roots in the metaphysical aspect of a thing. Truth of a thing lies in its workability. And so the principle is not merely the criterion of truth but also of the nature of truth. Naturally, a thing is true to itself; if it is not true to itself it is everything or nothing. The thing manifests its nature. It manifests itself. It is its being itself. And that is why it can render satisfaction by its intrinsic value. Value has no doubt a subjective aspect but it is none the less objective. Things are valued because of their worth. Values are rooted in things, in their very nature, and therefore we want to know things. Knowledge is valuational. It knows the nature of things - things in their reality, and realise their value, and therefore we want to know and must know. Philosophy is not a wishful thinking,

but a useful thinking, it is not a visionary thinking but a necessary thinking.

So it is pragmatic to know first, and know everything, the reality as a whole, before we deal with anything in the world. "The aim at philosophic understanding is the aim at piercing the blindness of activity in respect to its transcending functions." "Look before you leap" is really the pragmatic approach. It is more of a foresight and insight than of narrowing the outlook and the approach. It should not be interpreted from the 'safety first' point of view, as merely the precautions hint. To remain transcendent in acts and not in knowledge is putting the cart before the horse, ignoring the very nature of knowledge from both the aspects i.e. from the activity and transcendence point of view. Knowledge is activity and that too a self-transcending one.

What is that "which being known, everything else becomes known" is really a question of a philosophy with daring spirit. So it is worthwhile to know the self. Secondly, as the truth of a thing lies in its workability, it behoves the self to know itself first, and to realise itself fully, in order to know and have its full functioning. It being the source of all knowledge, if true to itself by manifesting itself fully, it shall surely yield omniscience.

Ordinarily in speculative or critical philosophies we arrive at a world view, a total perspective of the reality or a world hypothesis by coherence, by structural corroboration. There is structural corroboration as well as the multiplicative corroboration. Data and danda, empirical and rational, go hand in hand in the process of cognition. S.C. Pepper rightly observes "Cognition needs both types of refinement as much, as a bird needs two wings. The relative

claim of the two can never be settled short of omniscience or at least of a highly adequate world theory ."¹

Metaphysical justification for the approach

Philosophical search begins when we are dissatisfied with piecemeal solution in our approach to reality. Then we try to know the reality as a whole, we wish to have a world-view, in order to find out the ultimate reality that can serve as a basis of all the truths, and thereby give certainty. Reality is there, and it is for ever. Philosophy is the pursuit of its knowledge to know reality and that too as a whole, with a goal of finding out something ultimate in it. So the means and measures must be competent enough to embrace the whole of reality. As the subject matter, so the means and the method. It is in this sense that "the epistemology grows out of the metaphysics.". No metaphysics, no knowledge-problems, and no methods, nor any means and ways of knowing. Metaphysics is not merely a matter of postulation. If it is ^{were} so, then philosophy is a wishful thinking, utter subjectivism. Metaphysics is a matter of knowledge and knowledge on its part always reveals reality. As we want to know the whole of reality and the ultimate reality i.e. the totality of things and things in their reality, we turn to metaphysics.

We are here concerned with metaphysics only for having justification for our doctrine under consideration. Let us try to see, then, how far the doctrine is justified from the metaphysical point of view. In our doctrine "he who knows the self, knows all" it is presumed that there is an all-comprehensive reality which we want to know and that it can be known no doubt, and that too by knowing the self, which in reality exists. Now as metaphysics

1. The World Hypotheses.

deals with the nature of things let us try from the metaphysical point of view to understand precisely the nature of the self, of knowledge, and of 'all' i.e. the universe at large.

Here, self is another name for soul, spirit, consciousness, or mind (in its broadest sense of the term). "Soul is the basis of the unity of individual consciousness and conduct." Metaphysically speaking self is a mobile (dynamic) being having faculties of consciousness and conduct. Whatever else the thing may or may not do, it manifests, metaphysically speaking, its own nature. So in conscious activity the self is manifesting its own nature, is maintaining its being. In a way its knowing is its own being, of course from the substantial point of view, when seen as a thing in itself. Here, knowing and being are one. In knowing lies its self-manifestation.

This knowing or conscious activity has a double aspect. It knows itself and also the other things; it maintains self-consciousness, which is felt in its ego sense, while knowing other objects. So, as external objects, things can have their own existence without the knower, so also the knower can maintain its own existence without having any other object of knowledge to be known. Its knowing nature will go on manifesting itself in its self-consciousness. So ontologically, both the knowing self and objects are independent and can maintain their own existence even in the absence of the other. In short, looking to the thing-in-itself knowing and being are one, and while knowing external objects knowing is being of its own self, it is not being other things. It does not transform into other things. It remains a soul the sentient through and through. This should be kept in mind while thinking of the nature of knowledge. Knowledge has double reference: one to

the subject, other to the object. So knowledge is substantially one with the subject, the knower and separate from the object. Substantially both knowledge and object of knowledge are separate entities.

Knowledge and its object are not one, they are related only. And for relation we seek some common ground, some identity, whereby knowledge can really grasp the object and can faithfully account for the reality of the object, can acquaint us with the object as it is. So there must be some identity in order that knowledge can be true to the object, and there in fact the identity is. But it is a formal identity, and not a material one. So knowledge is formally identical with the object but materially different from it. With reference to an object, knowing is not being, and if we take knowing and being as one, we, in fact, ignore the very self-transcendent nature of knowledge. Knowledge by this self-transcending nature formally becomes one with it and conceives an idea of a thing. We may call it a reflection or an image. The concept is true to the thing as it grasps the essence of a thing, through this reflection that maintains formal identity. It identifies itself with the thing on one side and it is a form of knowledge, a manifestation of knowledge on the other side. So in cognitive action the self by this self-transcendent power becomes formally one with the object and that formal self-manifestation is the common background for both.

But idealists ignore the difference of these two categories: being and knowing, and also of knowing and doing, and they take being, knowing and doing as one and finally come to Absolute Monism and the result is, as Martin remarks, a type of nihilism. "The road to nihilism (the reduction of something to nothingness) begins when one or more of these notions is reduced to another.

Much of modern philosophy since Kant has been the history of the ways in which men have tried to reduce one of these categories to another."

But this type of reduction is not groundless. It has the background of the experience of the great sages and seers, they say. But their experience is either misunderstood by the sages themselves or it is misinterpreted by the followers or the scholars. Self-consciousness at the ego-level is only the reference to the self within, it is mere awareness, and not apprehension or knowledge of the self. Self-knowledge is not easy of reach, as there prevails self-delusion by body infatuation because of *adhyāsa* (super imposition). Self-knowledge in its reality is achieved through self-realisation. And in that state of self-realisation there is experienced a unique event, what they call *samādhi*, where *chayātā*, *dhyāna* and *dhyeyā* become one. There is no difference among the knower, knowledge and (the object of knowledge) the known. And right they are from the very metaphysical point of view. There is intense inwardness self-centredness. So the knower, the self, knows itself and the attention is not in the least diverted outside. In this state of *samādhi*, one is absorbed in its enjoyment. So this experience is interpreted with a bias of the seer. Bias can be removed only by the omniscience, but omniscience does not dawn all of a sudden. It is not always coexisting with the beginning of self-realisation. There are stages in the self-realisation too. One has to reach the highest point, where shines omniscience.

Second point for the background of this misunderstanding is the misunderstanding of the absolute point of view. When the thing is seen in-itself without any reference to other things, it is the absolute point of view. Here in our problem the knowledge phenomenon is looked by the sages from that

view point and occasionally preached and interpreted accordingly. The knower in the knowledge situation is self itself. In a way knowledge is self-activity and it is not separate from the self. Knowledge is also cognitive faculty of the self, and that too is not separate from the self. Knowledge as a concept of the subject, though true to the object, is formal, and as a form, it being the manifestation of the self, is not substantially separate from the self. Thus, from the absolute point of view, in every knowledge phenomenon the knower, knowledge and the known - the subject, object and knowledge - all the three are one, none is separate from the self. So they say "Verily all this is the self, Brahman", and right they are. So now, all the reality as an object of knowledge be said focussed in the self. Hence self being the source, validity and an integrating basis of all knowledge of reality can thus be called an all-comprising, as well as all-comprehensive, ultimate reality.

Everyone has consciously or ^{un}consciously some notion of reality and ultimate reality, and thus have a world-view of his own. It guides him in his conduct. For "The reality of the situation is a selective norm for the act."¹ "all dynamic acts are controlled by an intuitive grasp of the situation as a whole."² What is required is the grasp of the situation as a whole so that we can have insight into the things. On the sense of wholeness we feel security, certainty and propriety regarding the results of our approach and efforts. But one bites off as much of the reality as one can grasp. "The reality of the situation is whatever actually is the case the complete situation in which the organism is making his decision and his response..."³

1. Peppert: Sources of Value, p.450

2. Dr.Radhakrishnan: I.V.L. p.149

3. Peppert: Sources of Value p.440

But "Ordinarily the reality of the situation referred to is a relative reality - relative to the capacities of the organism to make discriminations in his environment and to learn by experience."¹

"Where these powers (of discrimination) are limited, he can have cognisance of reality only relative to these powers." But can he increase his powers? Yes, Pepper writes: "Man has the power to increase his powers of discrimination apparently without theoretical limit", and before coming to the conclusion has illustrated it: "the fact that man's discriminations do extend beyond his biological endowments. By microscopes, telescopes, thermometers, electrometers and so on, he extends his sensory discriminations. By language, mathematics, and logic, he extends his rational discriminations. By tractors, ship, dynamos, telephones, radio, he extends his motor co-ordinations. He leaves his biological limitations far behind." Considering these facts we realise no doubt that man "extends his discriminations beyond his biological limitations" by various means and methods; but are these really the illustrations of "increase of powers of discriminations?" In my opinion so far these illustrations go, the various powers or the capacities are not increased, but they are provided with better means and methods to extend discriminations or render wider, minute and more exact discriminations regarding the realities. Of course by surgery and medicine these powers are increased, so there is no denial of the fact that the powers of discrimination in general can be increased; and it is within one's own power too. As medicine and surgery are the means so are cultivation and education too. Preschings and practices are therefore developing man's potentialities. Practices of the Yogas

1. Pepper: Sources of Value, p.440.

illustrate the fact. So to conclude, it is a fact that the powers of cognition and discrimination can be increased and what can be increased can reach its zenith. So the cognitive power at its fullest or perfection can turn out to be omniscience.

In our search for the ultimate reality it is both rational and practical that we start from the empirical and go to the ultimate. The reality of the situation, we respond to, is the phenomenal or empirical aspect of the reality, and not the ultimate reality itself. As a situation or a phenomenon it may be a whole, but it being not a cosmic reality it is partial, and as cannot be called ultimate. Secondly, as a phenomenon it being momentary and a form of change, it has something in the basis that undergoes the changes and can be in a sense ultimate. Thirdly, situation being always complex, there must be something ultimately situated to turn out to be a situation. Being phenomenal in form, it has something in the basis which has entered into the composite phenomenon. But if we extend the idea of a flux from the limited phenomenon to the cosmic one and call the world a flux, we cannot arrive at either ultimate or relative reality, nor can we account for the flux; one must in order to account for the flux outlive the flux, and in that sense the cultivating element being more lasting and a witness to (criterion for) the changing reality must itself be ultimate reality. So the reality of a situation referred to is a relative reality, not only "relative to the capacities of the organism," but also relative to the ultimate reality. Change and permanence being the aspects of the reality neither of them be called ultimately real, each of them is relatively real. Neither of them is absolute, both are relative.

It would be convenient to understand the whole of reality from Shankara's point of view, for he accepts degrees of reality based on three types or grades of existence. He has done justice to a greater extent than many of the advaitins to epistemological as well as metaphysical aspects of reality. He has accepted the relative truth of empirical knowledge on the basis of nature of knowledge and also propounded metaphysically the relative reality of the world on the basis of the nature of existence. According to advaita view he accepts the three grade of existence:

1. Pāramārthika Satta,
2. Vyāvahārika Satta,
3. Prātibhāsika Satta.

In these three grades of existence we would find various degrees of reality. Human reason has given us a transcendental method to arrive at truth both by reason and experience. It is from the very nature of things that we have learnt to approach reality from various view-points in order to know different aspects of reality. From the absolute point of view we see the thing in itself. While the thing is self-existent, when it does not depend upon anything else for its own existence, we call its existence a pāramārthika satta and its reality an ultimate reality. When the thing depends on other things for its existence i.e. when it is not self-existent, its existence should be called related existence or vyāvahārika satta; for, here the component things are no things in themselves but they have entered into some sort of relation by way of inter-action, (vyavahār) on the strength of trans-action capacity. Their activity is not, then, confined to the limits of the thing itself, but has gone beyond. Vyāvahārika Satta is always transient, for, it expects the

union of at least two ultimately real things. The word 'vyavahāra' itself suggests it. The activity of the thing itself can never be called vyavahāra, but can be called self-manifestation or manifestation of its own nature. The vyavahārika satta (existence) being derived and not self-existent its reality cannot be called ultimate. Its reality is the derived reality, a related reality. It is reality, no doubt, for it is the outcome of something ultimately real at the basis. It cannot be called absolutely unreal. It is relatively real. Shankara in this sense, calls the world a real world, not the ultimately real, but relatively real. And for the validity of relative reality of the world he gives authority of the empirical knowledge. Now the third type of existence like the nature of images in process of reflection is called pratibhasika satta. Thereby he accounts for the existence of delusion and māya. It has a substantial basis of the subject and formal reference to the object. If we speak in terms of the self and the notself, these three grades of existence do proper justice to degrees of reality on one hand and to types of knowledge on the other. Metaphysically, when things remain confined to their own limits and maintain themselves their own existence they are ultimately real. But when they enter into some substantial relation, they give vyavahārika satta - related reality. And when they enter into formal relation only, they give pratibhasika satta which is a conceptual reality. There is no substantial relation but only the formal relation; it is of a nistic character.

Shankara, thus, admits the reality of the world as ^{hā}vyavārika satta as the related reality, on the basis of empirical knowledge and grants the duality of the subject and the object, or of the self and the notself. But for the nistic fact, he poses some identity between them. In his opinion, the

subject in order to know the object must be one with the object, and for that they must have some substantial identity by nature in the basis, the basis being Brahman. Thus, he ignores the very transcendental nature of knowledge and states knowing and being as one. He cannot realise the formal identity and material diversity of the subject and the object, of the self and the notself, in the knowledge situation. So, in his opinion, Brahman is the source of the duality of the self and the notself, which are one in their ultimate form of reality and are different in the form of the related reality.

But here we do not penetrate the grounds for the truth or falsity of the principle of identity (oneness) of the self and the ^{not-}notself in Brahman. If the principle is true by knowing the self one can realise himself as Brahman, and as everything is verily Brahman he can know everything. But if we take the principle as false and accept the duality of the self and the notself on the basis of empirical knowledge and its self-transcendent nature, we cannot admit time-space limitations to perfect knowledge. The self in the state of perfection can have perfect knowledge and then it can know everything. If we accept the thing-in-itself aspect of reality, perfection lies in self-realisation. So by self-realisation the self can be omniscient.

Concept for the unity of the whole reality: Being

As some orthodox (Indian) systems seek unity of the whole of reality in all-comprising concept of Brahman, so also the Western systems try to find it in the concept of being. It is in the attempt to arrive at a view of the totality or the whole of reality that they try to seek some synthetic principle of reality. John Wild poses 'being' as a principle of synthesis: "What we are concerned with is a prior and more difficult task, that of attaining agreement

amongst ourselves concerning the nature of existence itself. This must carry us to the more foundational regions of metaphysics,.....first philosophy. Hence the principle of synthesis, I shall attempt to present.....¹ is a metaphysical principle, the principle of being and its diverse modes." "What we desire is not only a synthesis but a true synthesis which can be verified by accessible evidence. Theories are not purely subjective instruments. They intend or refer to reality, and the first obligation of the philosopher is to being as it really is."²

"In particular, is there any one concept holding everything whatsoever within its scope?"³ "There is such a concept with a real objective reference. In our language it is symbolised by the word being."⁴ "If being were an abstract universal, or a supreme genus, as has often been supposed, it would have to be abstracted from all real difference. If so, it would be emptiest of all concepts, and actually equivalent to nothing, as Hegel pointed out. It includes them all within its range. Hence, it is not the emptiest but rather the richest of all concepts."⁵ Starting from this changing empirical world of common sense and science, now-a-days, there is a general tendency to take reality as something dynamic by nature. Urban writes: "We seek to understand not merely classes and laws, but reality in its individual character; not only as a static order, but as a living, moving process. It is seen to be intelligible philosophies par excellence."⁶ for this reason that evolutionary philosophies. No intelligible concept of

1. East West Philosophy, p. 250.

2-3. Ibid, p. 251.

4. Ibid p. 252.

5. Ibid.

6. Intelligible world p. 436.

evolution is possible without the idea of a system." "There is a certain structure of reality, a certain order of value, that forces itself on all speculative thinkers, entirely irrespective of their prejudices, realistic or idealistic, ~~the~~ intellectualistic or voluntaristic or what not." ¹

"This dominating structure seems to me to be roughly as follows. There are certain broad divisions within the series, e.g. Matter, Life, Mind and Spirit. Without recognition of these divisions, no intelligible philosophy can be written." ²

There are various realms of reality among which works up some principle of reality at the basis which is dynamic and ultimate. Joad writes : " I am thus led to postulate the presence in the universe of a dynamic force or principle of change, which enters into association with matter to form living organisms and is known to the biologist as life, to the psychologist as mind and to myself as the stream of consciousness which constitutes my being." ³

It is now plain that ^{it} is self, soul or spirit that works as a dynamic ultimate principle or matter and also at the levels of life, mind and spirit.

Now let us try to seek justification for the ultimacy, richness and dynamicity in the being. Being is not merely a mental concept; it is a reality, a fact of life and beyond. Srimad writes :- "Being (sat), whatever it is, is verily being, straight of approach and easy of access, and it can be found everywhere." (S.R. p. 267).

1. Ibid p. 440.

2. Ibid. p. 441.

3. Philosophical aspects of Modern Science, Pp. 271-272

We saw various concepts of ultimate reality as being. We have seen here mainly the prominent concepts of being: Being as the Brahman; being as purely metaphysical or ontological principle in the sense of common existence; being in different grades of reality from the evolutionistic point of view as a dynamic principle and let us try if we ^{can} find scope for all of them in one wider concept of being. Śrīmaṇḍ defines, according to Jainism, being as the composite basis of change and permanence 'Utpad-vyayachhānvyā-yuktam sat.'

Reality of a thing lies in its being. If it ceases to be what it is, it ceases to exist. So being is the principle of ultimate reality or being itself is the ultimate reality. But being in a sense is self-manifestation of a self-existent thing. In self-manifestation the thing preserves its substantial constancy while undergoing the formal changes. One form takes the place of the other, but the substance at the core remains the same. The transformation is due to the manifestation of a thing. The thing maintains its status by this self-manifesting nature or else it is nothing. This is no utilitarian criterion, but a metaphysical one. Formal change and substantial constancy and permanency are naturally the characteristics of being. Being of a thing lies in its form as well as its substance. So being is both formal and trans-formal. It is within change and beyond change. It undergoes the change and is above change. Being is self-manifestation of a thing. So being not only pervades all existence but also is its ultimate reality, dynamic reality. Hence all the richness of reality lies in being. So, though we have a concept of being, being itself is not a concept, but ultimate reality. It pervades all existence, be it Pārmar-thika sattā, Vyavahārika sattā or Prātibhāsika sattā. So being is ever and everywhere, so rich, so dynamic, so ultimate.

Yet being need not be worded with the capital letter as such. It is neither organic nor super-organic ~~max~~ ~~supra~~ as in the sense of some supreme thing, though it goes to make all organic and inorganic things what they are. No being, no thing; no thing, no being. But then, everything has its own being. Yes, and there we are at a proper understanding of being. There are infinite things and so are there infinite beings. Is there any supreme being? Yes. What is it? Shankara says, it is Brahman. Can we arrive at the being of Brahman? Yes, we can if we know the self. One who knows the self within, 'becomes Brahman, becomes all these.' How? Knowing the self is just realising the self, to be what it is, to maintain its *paramārthika satta* by giving up this *vyāvaharika satta*. And one can do that, because one by being its own self, maintains its perfect nature. So the self shall manifest the perfection of its knowing nature. And knowledge maintains formal identity with its objects, becomes, in a sense, all this. And on the other hand, the whole universe shall have *prātibhasika satta* in the self. So there is nothing wrong in saying that all this is verily the self and the self is all this. It is in this sense that the self is called the supreme being, i.e. *paramat*. If we understand the right meaning of being we would realise that these concepts of being and supreme being do justice to the dynamic aspect of reality.

But, there still remains the dynamic aspect of the *vyāvaharika satta*, which has relative reality and not the ultimate. The world has the *vyāvaharika satta*. It has relative reality, as it is not self-existent but is a composite being of the self and the not-self, the self and the matter. It can be well understood in terms of evolution. Joad has rightly observed that there is some dynamic principle which has entered into union with the matter to evolve into the world-reality, call it mind or consciousness. And further,

as Joad states, "(Like a search light) different minds are capable of being aware of quantitatively more extensive and qualitatively richer areas of the universe. Minds at different levels of development illuminate different areas of the universe." ¹ So here are two aspects of mind or self as being: one dynamic and the other cognitive or noetic. From noetic point of view we can conclude that the mind or the self in its development of being develops more and more its cognitive capacity as we know from the instances of beings with one, two, three, four, and five senses. So the self on reaching its full development can have complete knowledge of the reality, but it reaches its full development when it is wholly itself i.e. a *paramārthika satya*, which can be attained on self-realisation alone. Thus, from the epistemological aspect, we can conclude that in the process of evolution the conscious being at the zenith of its development can reach the omniscient state, wherein shall reflect the universe in the self.

Now, let us turn to its dynamic aspect. It would be convenient to understand the system of evolution in order to understand the dynamic being. We have observed that from the evolutionistic point of view there are different grades of reality like Matter, Life, Mind, Spirit. Urban states very lucidly the dynamic character of being at the basis of their evolution. "Matter itself become fully intelligible, reveals its full possibilities, what it really is, only when life supervenes upon it, when it expresses itself in life." ² and more through life. "Similarly, life reveals what it really is only when mind supervenes upon it." ³ "Mind, too, as intellect becomes intelligible to us, shows us what it can be and do, only when it is guided by mind as spirit." ⁴

1. Philosophical Aspect of Modern Science.

2-3-4. The Intelligible World p.442.

"For all, the essence of reality has been activity, movement - for all, the more immanent this activity; the higher the life, the more developed the reality."-Of course, the relative reality or the Vyavaharika satta . So, at all levels of evolution there works up a principle of consciousness, i.e. self, which loads the combined activities either with impulse or insight, consciously or subconsciously, in organic or inorganic constructions and creations. Secondly, if we see evolution from the view point of self-development we will find evolution of the self at different levels. The self unfolds (acquires) greater and greater capacity at the different levels of being - at inorganic level in terms of Jainism nigod, beings with one sense like the vegetation, water-bodied, earth-bodied, gas-bodied, fire-bodied; at organic level being with two, three, four and five senses, beings with mind, beings with reason. This, in a sense, can be called spiritual evolution. There is definitely the development of cognitive capacity. So, at a level of self-perfection the self can turn out omniscient, no doubt. Metaphysically speaking, there are three grades of reality. When seen at a thing in-itself the self-existing thing is perfect in it-self, it being a paramarthika satta. Thus the pure self is the perfect self. This purity is nothing but the realising of itself. So man's consciousness by self-realisation can attain perfection, and thereby the omniscience.

Axiological justification

Philosophy is a system of knowledge of reality. In a system there is always implicit valuation of the material systematised. And knowledge in its comprehensive and penetrating aspects is valuational. So philosophy is by nature valuational. Hence, we cannot avoid the value problem. It is now

universally accepted that values are rooted in reality. The very problem of real and unreal itself is a problem of values. Valuation presupposes the subject, but values are not always subjective.

When we go to seek the reality or the unreality of things, we are raising the problem of value. The reality of the world, in our encounter with it, poses the problem before us; hence the philosophical search. Values prevail through out and play dominant part in our search from the very start to the final destination. "Value is not value, because it satisfies man. It is value because of its intrinsic nature as real."¹

According to Spinoza, as Mac Cracken states, there are three types of valuation: Metaphysical valuation, Moral valuation and valuation through non-moral, relative to man. He gives two types of metaphysical valuation: the absolute and the comparative. These two types of metaphysical valuation can be comprised in the ultimate and relative aspects of reality. When we consider the thing in itself, it can be called perfect by itself, and it can be said to have absolute value; and it can be valued for itself. But when it is considered in relation to other things in a system in terms of degree of dependence on others they can be said to have relative value. This has the basis in the relative and ultimate (i.e. Vyāvahārika and Pāramārthika) existence. The vyāvahārika or the relative existence is not self-existence, so it is incomplete, and it being composite it is transient; while the pāramārthika one being self-existent is complete in itself, perfect and everlasting. Hence, the self being independent and self-existent self-realisation is considered to be of supreme value. From the evolutionistic

1. Mac Cracken, Thinking and Valuing.

point of view, too, the self or the spirit is the supreme reality, because in self-realisation the process of self-evolution reaches its culminating point. The ethical valuation and humanistic valuation have for their criterion a reference to consciousness. Essence of all ethics and all being, be it human or non-human, lies in remaining true to one's own self and in maintaining one's own status on the basis of self-existence. In order to do justice to others and to one's own self, one must realise the thing-in-itself aspect of being within and without i.e. in all individual beings as well as one's own being. So in self-realisation lies the supreme ethical value. Religion is in a way application of philosophy. Finding self as the ultimate, one takes the path of self-realisation; and it is the religion at par in the strict sense of the term - 'dharma', which means maintaining one's essential nature. "Every form of life, every group of men, has its dharma, which is the law of its being."¹ "Dharma..... is conformity with the truth of things."²

In our argument we have at the basis maintained the metaphysical aspect of reality to arrive at the ultimate reality of the self; for, metaphysics is the science of all sciences. It is the basis of truth, validity and valuation. It is concerned with all being in dynamic and cognitive functioning. It (metaphysics) is in fact, as we have been rightly called, the first philosophy. We have seen that the self is ultimate from various points of view. While going to seek the source of knowledge we arrive at the self as ultimate. Knowledge, however seen and dependent, is conscious by nature; and as such it is a manifestation of the self, and not of the notself. And on the

self-realization the self reaches its absolute state and stands ultimate as omniscient. The self by its self-conscious nature stands as the ultimate validity in all the states of knowledge. And "men refer to this (i.e. ultimate reality) as the criterion or criteria of reality. "Sense of relativity must have some thing ultimately real as a standard of all standards. Even the sceptic cannot deny its ultimacy.

As a being the self maintains the *pāramārthika sattā* and stands as ultimate reality eternally existing. By its dynamic nature the self manifests all kinds of relative beings or *vyāvahārika* existence in all its forms and this we can realise in the process of evolution. The world being the *vyāvahārika sattā*, there the self remains as ultimate at the basis from which world derives its existence. The self in its highest cognitive capacity, the omniscience, reflects the whole of the universe within itself and provides the ultimate basis for the *pratibhāsika sattā* (the reflected reality) in the widest sense of the term. Knowledge for its validity always has a reference to reality. The self provides the double reference by serving as the subject and maintaining formal identity to the object. The self stands as ultimate in arriving at the truth value of reality; and also for the ethical and religious values, the self is ultimately to be referred to and to be realised.

Thus, in our search for reality, we cannot but arrive at the self as ultimate from various aspects. So now we would realise the significance of Śrīmad's conclusion: "We see various sects and systems of thought. It is merely the difference of various view points. But from the root of one ultimate reality all of them are sprung and spread." (S.R.E p.196) and

also we would realise the significance of his interpretation of the doctrine
 - "He who knows the self knows all," and shall see the propriety of his
 approach. ^{In} Upanisads too it has been repeatedly stated and insisted upon
 that "Eken jñāten sarvam jñātaḥ bhavati". "He, who knows it, knows the
 essence of the cosmos." And it is because of such a key-position of self-
 knowledge in the whole of philosophy it has been thought of, as
 Dr. Radhakrishnan observes, "as Ātma-vidyā, knowledge of the self."¹

1. The Source Book of Indian Philosophy.