

## **Let science and intuition work together**

SUNANDA DEGAMBODA

Department of Industrial Management, University of Kelaniya, Kelaniya, Sri Lanka.

E-mail: sunanda@kln.ac.lk

### **ABSTRACT**

Does modern science, which depends totally on inductive and deductive investigation methodologies give us absolute knowledge, or is there another mode of generating knowledge outside these two methodologies? This paper attempts to explain that modern science has inherited the mankind, during its existence of over three hundred years, a body of knowledge, which is not only uncertain and transient, but also is relative. The very nature of the way the universe presents itself to us and human limitations prevent scientists from generating a body of knowledge that is absolute, or at least reliable. This study reveals that in some instances new knowledge have emerged in ways not akin to scientific investigation methodology. This source of knowledge is popularly referred to as intuition, but not much work has been done to ascertain the process and realities of intuitive knowledge. A conceptual model of the brain enables us to visualize it as having right and left halves and that those who are stronger on the right can get intuitive sparks that may become seeds of new knowledge. The paper concludes that scientific explorations could be complemented by intuition, which emanates from the right brain and directed training could develop right brain skills.

**Key words:** Inductive and deductive methodology, Evolution of knowledge, Intuition, linear and divergent thinking.

### **INTRODUCTION**

After living in the era of "modern science" for a few centuries, only rarely the man has attempted to evaluate what science and scientists have given them. Mankind has entrusted the responsibility of probing the mysteries of the universe, its birth, existence, and death to scientists and humans have kept for themselves the routine of mindless living. Three hundred years later, scientists have turned back to tell us that they have found nothing concrete. Zukav (1980) stated that "We are not sure, but we have found enough evidence which indicate that the key to understand the universe is You".

What amount of wealth, resources, and time have we spent only to be dissatisfied receivers of this lamentable answer of scientists, and what amounts will be spent to let scientists repeat the same answer at different points in times in the future? This provoking revelation challenges the way we were used to look at the world for over