CHAPTER 5
In the last four chapters we attempted to formulate the problem of Tradition and Revolution according to Krishnamurti. Along with the exposition of Krishnamurti's ideas we also took note of the different formulations of 'crisis' made available by different thinkers. The problem of Tradition and Revolution, as Krishnamurti views it, needs an holistic approach which we find lacking in the writings of the most of the contemporary thinkers. This particular aspect justifies my plea that Krishnamurti's views demand serious engagement.

In this last and concluding chapter we shall discuss Krishnamurti's views in comparison with Plato, Marxist philosophy, the Existential philosophers like Sartre, psycho-analysts like Freud and also the Buddhists. These thinkers represent both the East as well as the West and an
analysis of their writings help us to see how Krishnamurti goes beyond all of them. A usual classification that we employ in the case of most of the philosophers do not hold good when it comes to Krishnamurti. Therefore it becomes necessary to approach him in a totally different way. I have also tried to discuss Krishnamurti's views on cognition, relationships, mind/brain, nothingness, truth and reality, and freedom. The discussion of these notions becomes important for the single reason that these concepts are closely related to the problem of Tradition and Revolution. Some of these concepts may seen as unrelated. But I have tried to make a case for each of them as implications of the central problem of Revolution. In all these discussions I have tried to bring in my own views about Krishnamurti's position. In each of these sections attempts have been made to highlight my agreements and disagreements. Krishnamurti has contributed to the debate of tradition and modernity in his own way. He finds that both of them are equally problematic and must be rejected. I discuss his views on this along with that of Gandhi and Ambedkar. Finally I should admit that this study is in no way exhaustive and only claims to be an attempt to violate a thinker and a problem which is very crucial for the healthy existence of our society.

Implication of Revolution:

For Krishnamurti, revolution means total transformation of the human psyche. It is realizing the unknown, through self-knowledge and understanding- The unknown is nothingness, which is the real nature of the human being. It alone can bring order to the disordered and chaotic world situation. Revolution
is knowing the truth; and truth can dissolve the sorrow and misery of the world. The very nature of revolution according to Krishnamurti, is to have insight into sorrowfulness of the individual, which reveals the fictitious and irrational content of the mind and of the social structure.

Krishnamurti maintains that it is only through psychological revolution that global relationship can be established because the psychologically transformed mind is free from division and conflict. It is full of compassion and love. Human relationships based on love are free from any particular identification and attachment. Love will be the basis for the new world. To the transformed mind, relationship is global. It does not belong to any race, sect, nation and ideology etc. It is alone in the sense that it is all-one. The entire world is its home. Thus revolution according to krishnamurti is the realization of the essential nature of humanity which brings sanity in one's relationship to everything. Sanity is whole, healthy and holy. It is living without any image, or conclusion. It is possible only when one has the self knowledge and goes beyond verbalization. Krishnamurti holds that, "The universal, the global feeling of all human beings and their relationship, can only comes into being when the words nation, tribe, religion have all disappeared."\(^1\)

In freedom relationships are global. It is living without division and conflict. Freedom is understanding of life with profound intelligence and vitality. Revolution brings about transformation in human consciousness, since consciousness is the consciousness of all human beings. Change in one's consciousness brings about change in the human consciousness. Krishnamurti distinguishes between two levels of consciousness. Consciousness as it appears and consciousness as it really is. Consciousness as it appears is known and consciousness as it really is unknown. So the unknown is consciousness as it is which is devoid of fear, anxiety, hatred, desire, division, conflict, and sorrow etc. It is of the nature of nothingness, integration, intelligence, eternity, harmony, peace and happiness. Consciousness which is nothingness is autonomous and independent. It does not depend for its existence, on something other than itself. The unknown is the timeless renewal of the nothingness which implies experiencing of wisdom.

Krishnamurti maintains that the unknown is the true and real nature of consciousness. It alone can give significance to

2 The known consciousness is manifested with the burden of the past, which includes time, choice, desire, division, contradiction and sorrow. It has all the qualities of the traditional mind, where as the unknown is devoid of all these. Its nature is 'nothingness'. See G.Vedaparayana, "The Known and the Unknown: Jiddu Krishnamurti's Conception of Consciousness", Darsana International, Vol XXVI, No:4, October, 1986.

human existence. The unknown is the real and inalienable essence of consciousness. The unknown alone can render life meaningful because it is associated with goodness, love, compassion, intelligence and happiness. The creative happiness of the unknown is a *sine qua non* for the peaceful co-existence of humanity. According to Krishnamurti the individual and collective salvation or liberation is possible through the transformation of the structure of consciousness.

For Krishnamurti, revolution in the world can be brought about by the intelligent action of those individuals who are in the state of revolution, or who are in love with the whole. Radical change in consciousness affects a radical transformation in society. Psychological revolution should start with the individual before it manifests itself in the world, since the individual is the core of the society. The deep and radical change of the individual will have its reflection on the society. Krishnamurti says, "man is the measure of the world. You are the world not as an ideal, but factually. As the world is your self, in the transformation of yourself you produce a transformation of society."

Krishnamurti does not give any blue print as to what happens after revolution. He goes from fact to fact; and according to him revolution is not an idea or an ideal. It simply happens with the ending of the traditional mind.

Therefore what happens after revolution, can not be put in forms of thought. However for the revolution to take place, the traditional mind which always moves in the realm of the known has to be transcended or negated. The ending of the known involves the beginning of a definitely different form of mind and society.

With revolution, there is the cessation of fear, of 'me', which is the image, the knowledge and remembrance of the past and there will be no violence and brutality. There will be love and compassion that bring clarity to one self and he or she will be free from all kinds of illusions. The action of love puts an end to every form of fear, identification and every desire for pleasure. Then man does not conform to any ideal, concept, belief or person.

The revolutionary mind meets the challenge at every moment with adequate response and intelligence. Therefore there will be no crisis or chaos either at the individual or at the collective level. Revolution brings order in oneself and in the world. In the state of revolution, men are truly creative in living. Revolution is total renewal, a fundamental change in the structure of consciousness which is reflected in all spheres of life.

When there is revolution, there is an end to disorder. There will be no chaos or crisis in the society or in the world since there is an ending of inner chaos. All kinds of division—political, social, religious, national, ideological, economical—cease to be when the revolution takes place. Then there will be no scope for violence and war, aggression and poverty as there
will be no possessiveness and exploitation among the people. At cultural or social or political or ethnic or religious level, there will be no violent struggle and conflict since there will be only the activity of love. Love integrates both the inner and the outer world. It knows no separation and the whole humanity can survive in happiness and peace.

For Krishnamurti, revolution is total. It is not limited to any particular sphere of life, or a fragment of society. It encompasses the whole being of man and therefore the whole of society. A new culture is born due to revolution. Though the social institutions would exist, they would not be inhuman and violent; but work for the peaceful and harmonious coexistence of people. It is the world in a new order. Krishnamurti himself has no idea of that new world. According to him the new can never be new if it is put in thought. However the new will not be in terms of past. As Krishnamurti says:

I have no idea about the new world. The new world cannot be new if I have an idea about it. This is not just a clever argument, it is a fact. If I have an idea about it, the idea is born of my study and experience is it not? It is born of what I have learned, of what I have read, of what other people have said the new world should be. So the new world can never be new if it is a creation of the mind, because the mind is old.  

Reality and Truth:

Krishnamurti distinguishes between truth and reality. He calls the realm of thought as reality. Reality is that which is put together by thought. It is the knowledge of abstracted thought and includes both rational and irrational knowledge. The rational knowledge is that which is factual, logical and well-reasoned and the irrational knowledge is psychological in character. The irrational is fictitious and speculative. It is the result of invention of thought for psychological security and is responsible for division, conflict and misery in life and the world. Krishnamurti holds that the ending of reality in its psychological sense brings about a transformation in the mind. The ending of the fictitious reality is the beginning of truth. Truth is the mind which is empty of reality in its psychological sense. Truth is nothingness which gives the mind total security. The mind which is nothing acts sanely in the world of factual reality. "There is no psychological security in reality, but only complete security in nothingness. Then if that is so, to me, my whole activity in the world of reality is entirely different." 6

Nothingness;

Krishnamurti's notion of 'nothingness' is different from the existentialist notion of nothingness in general and from Sartre's conception of nothingness in particular. Existentialists describe nothingness as a state of uncertainty, 6

J.Krishnamurti, Truth and Actuality (Madras: KFI, 1992), p.40
ambiguity, confusion, anxiety, dread and unhappiness. Sartre equates nothingness with consciousness which is divided, conflicting, anxious, confused and sorrowful. He says that nothingness is the cause of man's sense of emptiness or vacuity. Nothingness is like a worm in the heart of the being of man. It is the basis of man's constant struggle to become something other than himself. But Krishnamurti considers nothingness in entirely different terms. To him nothingness means a mind which is holistic, and clear. It means a mind which is devoid of consciousness which is divisive. Mind which is nothing is totally empty of the content of thought. It is a mind which is subtle and secure, and is devoid of fear, anxiety, and sorrow—Nothingness stands for freedom which transcends freedom in the Sartrean sense.

Krishnamurti's concept of nothingness is very much similar to (Nagarjuna's) Madhyamika notion of nothingness (Sunyata). Madhyamikas like Nagarjuna, use nothingness in two senses. In one sense nothingness means the absence of any durable essence or nature in the phenomena (Samiriti Satta). In another sense nothingness means the transcendental truth (Paramarta Satta) which is beyond concepts and words. It stands for the mind which is beyond the structure of thought, and its world of the phenomena. Krishnamurti's notion of nothingness also has this double sense. He says that every thing is devoid of inherent nature. Like Nagarjuna, Krishnamurti dialectically shows that every thing or concept is empty of inherent nature. The world of phenomena or the reality of thought is relative, limited, and incomplete. That which is limited, relative, and incomplete does not have an inherent being. it is nothing or
empty within itself. in the world of phenomenon everything depends on every other thing, while nothingness has an independent existence. Thought does not have an inherent nature. Krishnamurti's notion of 'nothingness' is also transcendental in character. Transcendently it stands for truth which is absolute and ultimate. It refers to a mind which is independent and unconditional. Nothingness is timeless or eternal.

Brain and Mind Problem:

Krishnamurti uses the terms 'Brain' and 'Mind' synonymously. He says that the human brain or mind is the product of evolution. Physiologically the brain has grown larger in size, and psychologically the mind/brain has accumulated its content through time. In other words, the brain is conditioned not only physically but also psychologically. It is burdened not only with the factual, the rational and logical information but also with the fictitious, the irrational and the illogical knowledge. The illogical content of the mind/brain includes desires, choices, anxiety, pain, loneliness belief, fear, confusion, conflict etc. and is due to the dominance of thought over the brain, or is due to the registration in the brain of the unnecessary part of experience. Krishnamurti calls it the old brain or mind which is traditional, imbalanced and insane. He says that "the brain or the mind with continuity of its conditioning can never find anything new. He holds that it is only when there is the ending of the old brain"\(^7\) that the new

mind or brain comes into existence.

The new mind or brain is that which is totally transformed, not only psychologically but also physically. Radical revolution in the brain brings about a mutation in the brain cells and such a mind or brain is free from the burden of the thought. So it is free in the psychological sense also. Krishnamurti calls the free mind "universal" and "absolute". It is one with the universe or the cosmos. Cosmos means perfect order and the new mind has the order of the universe. Its order is eternal and infinite. It is different from the order of thought which is actually disorder. The radically transformed brain establishes contact with the universal mind and being completely free from the burden of the past, the new brain acts holistically. Radical revolution awakens the brain cells which were hitherto inactive. The new brain is full of energy. According to Krishnamurti, the new mind is not personalistic; it is not yours' or mine. It is totally impersonal in the sense that it is devoid of the center called the self. It is the embodiment of energy which is different from the energy of thought which is divisive and conflicting. Therefore it is difficult to say whether Krishnamurti differentiates between the brain and the mind. He treats them as one and the same. He gives importance to holistic perspective of mind and life. We cannot say that the brain alone is sufficient to understand Krishnamurti's philosophy of life as he has not confined his analysis of life and the world to the physical brain alone. He does not like to be misunderstood as a materialistic monist. Similarly he did not choose to explain life and world in terms of the mind, because he did not want to be identified as an
idealistic monist. It is possible that Krishnamurti uses the terms brain and mind synonymously in order to avoid the pitfalls of extremes of both idealism and materialism. As Stuart Holroyd says "Needless to say Krishnamurti himself, who regards naming and labelling as pursuits of dull mind, is indifferent as to what camp he is assigned to."  

Krishnamurti on Cognition:

Cognition is how we acquire and use knowledge. Cognitive process involves perception, memory, thought, knowledge and its usage. Before going to discuss the Cognitive theories put forwarded by psychologists, we have to understand whether the world is cognisable or not; on this philosophers have different opinions. The idealists, for the most part, refuse to recognize that the world is cognisable. They argue that the reality which we fail to cognise may possibly be cognised by higher beings, namely, gods, spirits etc. Their cognition is beyond man's reach. Hence idealists come to the conclusion that the world is unknowable. Some of them, for example Berkeley, in principle admit that the world is cognisable and even work out theories of cognition. But in doing so they focus on cognising their own thoughts rather than on cognising the objective world and human society. Agnostics doubt the possibility of cognising the world. On the other hand, materialists, particularly Marxists, hold that since the world exists objectively, it is possible to cognise it. They show that the cognitive process is carried out not by some

'pure' consciousness severed from man but by a real human being with the help of his mind; it asserts that the cognitive process is social in essence and nature. The cognitive subject is not an individual isolated from other people but a man who takes part in social life and uses forms of cognising activity developed by society.

To have a clear picture of cognition, and of how Krishnamurti deals with this problem, it is useful to have a glance at general theories of cognition. Psychologists in their effort to understand cognition, emphasize three general aspects: structure (the element and components of the intellect and their interrelationship), process (the particular activities or operations involved in taking in, interpreting, organizing and retrieving knowledge or information) and function (the process or goals of a person in dealing with the available, potential knowledge). Each of these components is important for an adequate understanding of cognition. Broadly there are three approaches i.e., the functional, structural and process approaches through which to understand cognition.

Functional theory explains human cognition in terms of functional connections between environmental conditions which stimulate the organism and the resulting behavior. Functional analysis tends to ignore the internal structures that influence behavior, Skinner (1957) is the representative of this approach. The objective of his approach is to predict and control behavior. Structural approaches have generally emphasized the mental components (such as memory and emotions) and the manner in which these components are organized. Structuralists have attempted to
analyze the rules of language (Chomsky, 1965) and identify the concepts that are substrata of human thought (Piaget, 1971). Piaget, the genetic epistemologist, emphasizes the mental structures and knowledge of the world. He argues that an understanding of mental phenomenon can best come from looking at the development of the mind. Chomskian theory of language ignores both functional and process components of cognition. The process approach psychologists (Shiffrin and Atkinson, 1969) have been explicit about how specific activities or processes are brought to bear an input. This approach is known as information processing, and views external stimuli as being altered by several kinds of process, including the recognition of a stimulus, recording into some other forms, storage of the transformed stimulus, retrieval from its stored location and the like. These processes take place in different structural components. This approach stresses on how letters and words are identified and how the combined meaning of words is calculated and how other information is retrieved and used. Its claim is that mental processes contribute to what people know and how they behave, or how knowledge is acquired and used in behavior.

To put it more briefly, the functional explanation of Skinner regards behavioral consequences and environmental stimuli as the two factors that completely determine behavior. For a structuralist, like Chomsky, structure takes the forms of rules for organizing the input in this case language. According to Piaget, structure means the organization of knowledge about experienced events and actions. All input is interpreted within the framework of such knowledge. Process accounts describe the way in which input is treated from the moment it arrives in the
Krishnamurti has no specific theory about cognition, but we can form a kind of theory of cognition from his teachings. While talking about memory, knowledge, thought, perception, which are included in cognition, he does not have any of the above views in his mind. But he gives a rational view about cognition. He expressed his views about cognition in the context of explaining how mankind and its thinking are conditioned. So there is a problem in the very nature of our understanding or in our cognitive procedure, which puts us in a chaotic situation. Krishnamurti points out to our habitual and mechanical activity in cognition. This is of the characteristic of the traditional mind; therefore humanity should become free from such a state for meaningful and intelligent way of understanding the actuality, the facts, the what is. One should develop choiceless awareness, without having any prejudices or preconceived notions. This is possible when the mind is perceptive and attentive, as it can reveal facts or what is. Such a mind is always ready to meet the challenges of life as it is empty and innocent. It dies each minute and renews itself. The perceptive mind which does not have any accumulations put together by thought; is nothingness. Nothingness is the creative void. Therefore Krishnamurti regards it as true cognition or complete comprehension of the truth. In such cognition, there is only simple experience, without image, concepts, ideas or thought or construction. It is a simple awareness of fact without any motive or desire. Therefore it is more integrated and intelligible approach to cognition than the other approaches, which have their limitations. According to Krishnamurti, "to see without distortion of fact of what you are,
not what you think you should be, is the beginning of wisdom."9
And he also says, "Experience is direct; then relationship is
direct and not through memory. It is this direct relationship
their brings freedom from conflict, and with freedom from
conflict that is integration."10

From this we can say that world is cognisable. The
world is not something in isolation of the individual,
Krishnamurti holds that 'you are the world'. In this sense,
understanding oneself is understanding the world.

Krishnamurti and Psychoanalysis:

Krishnamurti deals with the human mind and its
functioning. He 'analyses' human mind, in all its dimensions
but unlike the psychologists Krishnamurti does not admit the
phenomena of the unconscious or subconsciousness. Psychologists
like Freud, hold that the unconscious is responsible for the
abnormal functioning of the mind. Unconscious is the cause of
the mental disorders like neurosis and psychosis. Freud
maintains that disorders of the mind can be cured through
psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis helps to transform the
unconscious into the conscious. However, Freud maintains that
the unconscious mind can not totally be transformed into the
conscious mind. But Krishnamurti holds that the unconscious is
not something totally different from the conscious. He says that

9 Luis S.R. Vas (ed), Mind of J.Krishnamurti (Bombay; Jaico
10 J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on living, p.64.
the unconscious is the result of thought choosing some part of the mind to be conscious. Thought has the tendency to suppress the unpleasant content of the mind. The conscious part of the mind does not want the unconscious to come into the open.

According to Krishnamurti there is no need for psychoanalysis to bring the unconscious to the conscious level. It is enough if one realizes the fact that thought is responsible for the division of the mind into conscious and unconscious. Perceiving the mind as a totality brings about freedom which is different from the freedom advocated by the psychologists. The cure of psychoanalysis is confined to making man conformed to world as it is, where as Krishnamurti's notion of freedom implies that man is free from the insanity of selfishness, conflict, cowardlinesses, violence and war. And compared to Krishnamurti's notion of freedom the freedom that psychologists advocate is of less significance. The task of Krishnamurti therefore is entirely different from the task of psychologists. The aims of philosophy and psychology are not similar.

Krishnamurti as a Philosopher:

The question, whether Krishnamurti is a philosopher or not, is debated in academic circles. However, Krishnamurti says that, "I am not concerning myself with the founding of religious, or new sects, not the establishment of new theories and new philosophies."\(^{11}\) There are two schools viewing the issue in two

\(^{11}\)Cited in Arundati Sardesai "Epistemology of J. Krishnamurti" Indian Philosophical Quarterly, Vol XXIII, Nos. 3&4, July-October, 1996, p.455.
different ways. According to one school, Krishnamurti is not a philosopher in the proper sense of the term, since he does not lay claim to either system building or propounding a particular doctrine. The other school considers Krishnamurti as a philosopher as he has developed a philosophy consisting of a metaphysics, an epistemology, a pedagogy and ethics. But, we can say that the former school gives a proper estimate of Krishnamurti as a philosopher because he is against system building and propounding doctrines. He is not a philosopher of ideas, concepts and ideals and he was averse to theoretical speculation. He does not belong to a philosophical school or tradition. He does not have a philosophical predecessor. He did not identity himself with any school of thought, and his teachings are not in reaction to any school of philosophy. They are not also a modified form of any theory, or an integrated view of different religious, philosophical and psychological theories. His teachings are the outcome of his direct perception of truth, or an expression of the truth that he realized. To him truth is beyond speculative theories or doctrines, and it cannot be comprehended through a system of concepts. Therefore it is not correct to say that Krishnamurti developed a system of philosophy.

However, Krishnamurti talks of philosophy in its etymological sense, which means love of wisdom. That is, to Krishnamurti, philosophy means, love of truth or life. Truth is the nothingness of the mind, and is therefore beyond the grasp of

\[12\] Ibid., p.455.
intellect. Truth means the life which is undetermined by thought. Philosophy is living life independently of systems, images, ideals and beliefs. It is living from moment to moment in the total freedom of the mind. It is the art of being nothing and living life directly, or living in the 'present'. Krishnamurti maintains that, "this is not a philosophy, a series of theories. It is exactly what the word philosophy means the love of truth, the love of life. It is not something you go to the university to learn, we are learning the art of living in our daily life."\textsuperscript{13}

Therefore for Krishnamurti, philosophy is an understanding of truth which is beyond thought. Philosophy is the ending of mistaking reality for truth, or the cessation of the ignorance and the irrationality of approaching truth through reality. It is understanding the finitude of reality and going beyond it. Krishnamurti says:

Philosophy means love of truth, not love of ideas, not love of speculations. And that means you have to find out for yourself where reality is, and that reality cannot become the truth. You must understand the limitations of reality which is the whole process of thought.\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{14} J. Krishnamurti, \textit{Truth and Actuality}, P-60.
Although Krishnamurti uses the term 'Philosophy' in its epistemological sense, to him, it does not conform to the Western conception of philosophy. In Western philosophy, love is a constant quest. Wisdom is knowledge which is never final. Philosophy is a pursuit after a more and more reasonable knowledge. It involves a series of theories about conceptual problems and stands for free intellectual life. In the West, philosophy, like science, is a quest for truth and not its conquest. It is truth-seeking, and not its attainment. In this sense truth is relative, and in Western philosophy the answers to the seminal questions of life are not definite.

As the well known modern western philosopher, Bertrand Russell puts it, "Philosophy is to be studied, not for the sake of definite answers to its questions since no definite answer can as a rule be known to be true, but rather for the sake of the questions themselves".16

It is clear that the western philosophy almost emphasizes on knowledge based on intellect. It seeks to sharpen reason or thought which is ever incomplete. The Western mind with its Greek background has not realized the significance of


going beyond the intellect, by understanding its limitations, Krishnamurti holds that truth in the sense of the ending of Knowledge is alien to Western philosophy.\textsuperscript{17}

For Krishnamurti, real understanding is through ending of knowledge. Therefore for him, philosophy is not knowledge but the perception of truth in the sense of 'being' it. It is the actual realization of truth which is beyond thought, and a true philosopher is not a knower of truth, but truth itself. In the light of the above, we may say that Krishnamurti's philosophy is very much akin to the notion of Indian \textit{darsana} which means direct perception or seeing of the Ultimate Truth. Darsana, as Radhakrishnan defines it, "is the insight of the real revealed to the soul sense." However, Krishnamurti's philosophy can not be called a \textit{darsana}, since \textit{darsana} also means a philosophical system. And \textit{darsana} is also considered as an intellectual approach to life. It gives more importance to building systems of thought around truth than to its direct perception. It is concerned more with the consistency of their ideas than with the actual man and the society. And Krishnamurti feels that this system of philosophy dehumanizes man under the cover of theories and ideas instead of helping him live with actuality. That is why Krishnamurti has no sympathy with such systems of philosophies, Western as well as Eastern. Krishnamurti says:

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. J. Krishnamurti and David Bohm, \textit{The Ending of Time} (Madras: KFI, 1992), p.98.
"These philosophies have enslaved man. They have invented what society should be and sacrificed man to their concepts; the ideals of the so-called thinker have dehumanized."\(^{19}\)

Thus he wants us to perceive the truth instead of indulging in ideals, opinions and concepts. One should totally live with the actual world. So it may not be meaningful to call him an Indian or a Western philosopher. He is very much against the kinds of distinction which are verbally or psychologically constructed. They are non-existent for him. What is more important according to him is truth/fact, and the actual life. Therefore his teachings are a commentary on living. Its essence is humanism without any qualification.

Krishnamurti's philosophy is not a theory or a system about the truth. It is not a conceptual play around the concept of truth. His teachings are spontaneous and a direct commentary on life. He suggests that one should have clarity and simplicity about life and that is possible though intelligent understanding which springs from love and compassion.

Though Krishnamurti is against any act of comparison or estimation, here it may not be out of place to mention some of the parallel associations of his teachings with other well known academic/philosophical tradition(s). In this backdrop let us examine what seems to be Krishnamurti's main emphasis and place them in historical context. We want to show that his holistic

\(^{19}\) J.Krishnamurti, Letters to the Schools, p. 53
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approach may be connected with a long tradition. Here we are bringing other similar views to have a better understanding of Krishnamurti's teachings.

Krishnamurti and Buddhism:

Krishnamurti is often identified with the Buddha. It is held by many that Krishnamurti has taught what Buddha taught in a new idiom and a new style. His teachings are very much similar not only to Buddha's original teachings but also to the ideas of the later Buddhist philosophers. Like Buddha, Krishnamurti does not accept the notion of God as the creator, the sustainer and the destroyer of the world. Krishnamurti does not accept the vedic idea of an eternal, everlasting, and unchanging soul (atman). Like Buddha, Krishnamurti accepts life as a predicament of conflict and sorrow, and regards the idea of self as the cause of human predicament. Like Buddha, Krishnamurti regards realization of truth as seeing the things as they are. Seeing truth leads to freedom from conflict. Like Buddha, Krishnamurti holds that the truth can be understood only by understanding the nature of thought or consciousness. The ultimate or the absolute truth cannot be perceived without perceiving the relative or conventional truth. Like Buddha, Krishnamurti also rejects all kinds of authority and dependence.

He maintains that one must realize truth for oneself. Buddha said not accept anything just because it is said by religion or scripture or by a guru. One should accept anything only after seeing it for oneself. Like the Buddha, Krishnamurti also denounces the role of a guru in understanding the truth. Both Buddha and Krishnamurti maintain that one has to work out
one's own salvation. Krishnamurti's teaching is strikingly similar in its emphasis on awareness or mindfulness, to Buddha, and Krishnamurti gives importance to the concept of impermanence; both of them hold that there is nothing that permanent.

But unlike Buddha and the Buddhists, Krishnamurti never denies the reality of world. Buddha and Buddhists teach that becoming a monk and leading a life of continence is required for the realization of nirvana, whereas Krishnamurti contends that one can realize freedom by being very much in the world. Referring to Buddhism, Krishnamurti says "They have... denied the world. But I don't say to deny the world. On the contrary you have to live there." 20 This difference between Buddha and Krishnamurti is very significant. Unlike Buddha, Krishnamurti postulates the possibility of realizing freedom by being in the world.

Krishnamurti and Western Thought:

Krishnamurti's concepts of philosophy and freedom can not be equated with any of the Western philosophical traditions, because he contends that the Western philosophical tradition right from the Greek thought is basically intellectualistic. He maintains that Western thought has given importance to wisdom in the sense of knowledge and the Western philosophers have not realized the importance of wisdom in the sense of ending knowledge.

Krishnamurti's philosophy appears akin to some of the idealistic philosophers of the West like Plato, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Bradly and the evolutionists like Bergson. His notion of insight seems to be similar to the notion of intuition advocated by the Western Idealists. But upon a closer examination, it becomes evident that the intention of Western idealists is intellectual in character, whereas Krishnamurti's idea of insight transcends intellect. The implications of Krishnamurti's insights and the intention of Western idealists for human relations are entirely different. Krishnamurti's insight means a radical transformation in the structure of the mind itself. It has very profound implications for social transformation. But we can not find such implications in the case of the western idealists.

Krishnamurti and Plato:

Krishnamurti's concept of freedom is very similar to Plato's idea of Good. According to Plato, Good is a pure form which is beyond the realm of phenomena. It is eternal and timeless. To Krishnamurti the free mind is pure consciousness, it is absolute and eternal. Like Plato, Krishnamurti rejects idolatry. He criticizes the idol worshipers. However, there is difference between Plato and Krishnamurti. Plato's pure form is intellectual, whereas Krishnamurti's pure consciousness or mind transcendent is intellect. To Krishnamurti freedom is going beyond the intellect, and he calls it intelligence.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{21}Cf. Ibid., pp.127-28.
Krishnamurti can be compared with Plato in another aspect also. Both of them hold that free man has to necessarily work for the freedom of others. According to Plato a philosopher who has found liberation for himself must liberate every body else. Similarly Krishnamurti also maintains that a man who is transformed must work for the transformation of the human kind. In this respect, both Plato and Krishnamurti subscribe to the Buddhistic notion of Bodhisatva. The Bodhisatva is one who is liberated, but takes rebirth in order to liberate others from sorrow.\textsuperscript{22}

**Krishnamurti and Sartre:**

Krishnamurti's concept of freedom is similar, to a large extent to Sartre's conception of freedom. Both of them are the champions of human freedom. Sartre says that human consciousness is ontologically free. Therefore man is a free being. Man is the maker of himself or he is the architect of his life and the world. Krishnamurti also maintains that man is responsible for what he is. Man is the maker of his life. He is responsible for his condition and that of the world around him. Besides this similarity there is a fundamental difference between Krishnamurti and Sartre on the conception of freedom. To Sartre, freedom is self-determinism. It is a voluntary choice. It is acting with a chosen motive and end. But Krishnamurti's concept of freedom means a mind which is devoid of self-determinism.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., p.123
motives and ends. Freedom is a state of being in which the mind is empty of all its content. Freedom is consciousness which is without self, division, conflict and unhappiness.

Krishnamurti and Marxists:

Krishnamurti's thought, is in a way close to Marxism. Krishnamurti is anti-traditional. He rejects the notions of God, heaven, hell, destiny, the scriptures, the rituals etc. The objective of his philosophy is to liberate man from the bondage of suffering; by transforming the world. He envisages a world without unwarranted differences and divisions of any kind. But Krishnamurti's concern for man and the world goes far beyond the concern of Marxism. The Marxist concept of freedom involves a civilized society which is scientifically advanced. According to Marxism, freedom is possible by bringing a change in the social structure, as it believes that man can be transformed only by transforming the environment. But according to Krishnamurti a new world order can be brought about only by transforming or changing the individual psychologically and radically. He maintains that mind determines the environment and not vice versa. Mind has the capacity and power to overcome all the external constraints, as he says 'inner overcomes the outer'. The outer environment or the social structure is the product of the inner man. Therefore the world can not be changed unless man is changed inwardly. Though Krishnamurti says that the individual is not isolated from society, yet man is the society, 'you are the world', therefore the individual is according to him the collective. Transformation in the individual leads to transformation in the society. In this respect Krishnamurti is different from Marxism. He maintains that there is no need for
collective outward revolutions to achieve transformation of the world. To him, outward revolutions are not revolutions at all. They only modify the social structure, and can not affect the core of social reality which is the individual or the mind. He is of firm conviction that a radical change in the individual can bring about a change in the world as change in the individual inevitably affects the world.

Unlike Marxism, Krishnamurti does not envisage class conflict and antagonism. Marxists hold that revolution is possible only by augmenting the class conflict and antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. They treat conflict as an inevitable fact of capitalist society. They are of the view that all the problems of man are to be looked at from the economic point of view. But according to Krishnamurti thought is the fundamental problem of man, as it is thought which creates conflict and antagonism between bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Therefore the transformation of man and society is possible by ending of thought. It does not involve bloodshed or the vanquishing of the bourgeois by the proletariat. The revolution that Krishnamurti speaks is silent and peaceful. It does not involve any kind of violence. It is the ending of division, antagonism, conflict and violence in oneself by understanding the nature and the structure of thought. Like the Marxists, Krishnamurti subscribes to the evolutionary concept of mind, man and society. He holds that man, mind and society are historical products. One should understand the evolutionary process in order to understand the present condition of the human mind and the society. Marxism also maintains that man, mind, and society are historical. The present is the product of historical
development of social events. It holds that society evolves by stages—primitive communism, feudalism, capitalism, socialism, scientific marxism (communism). And an intellectual has to understand the social reality and work for its evolution towards the higher stage. But according to Krishnamurti, the radical social transformation is not evolutionary. It is not progressive and gradual, or it has no stages. It is ahistorical and timeless, the future is an illusion, it is only a product of thought's postponement of radical revolution. Future is the urge of thought to continue itself endlessly. The transformation can be brought about instantaneously, as according to him real revolution is in the 'present'. To Krishnamurti social transformation is basically psychological in character. Individuals have to transform themselves in order to change society. If there is no change in the present, the future will be the same as the present. Therefore he strongly opposes the social theories that advocate transformation in the future. Krishnamurti's standpoint would be very significant if we understand the results of outward or outer revolutions which ignore radical change in the individual.

Freedom:

The problem of freedom is one of the most important philosophical concepts. It has been one of the fundamental questions for the philosophers. The concept of freedom is ambiguous as it does not have a single and clear cut meaning. It is difficult to give a definite definition of freedom. Broadly, freedom can be distinguished as external and internal. External freedom may be equated with liberty—It stands for the civil
status of an individual. It entails certain rights to have and to do certain things. It includes civil rights like freedom to live, to property, to religion etc. Freedom in the sense of liberty means the freedom from external constraints. It signifies the absence of coercion. Liberty is not only 'freedom from', but also 'freedom to'. That is, liberty in its totality implies freedom to choose and not to choose. It is not only negative but also positive. External freedom can be assured through the establishment of the political, the economic, scientific, religious and legal institutions.

It is held that external freedom is incomplete without the internal freedom. Internal freedom is the freedom of man from 'within'. It is 'psychological' or spiritual in character. It implies the freedom of mind from division, conflict and sorrow. It also means the freedom of being from the determining factors whether physical and psychological. The conception of inner freedom also differs from thinker to thinker. The Vedantins have called it Moksha, which means the union of the individual self (Jiva) with the universal self (Brahman). They have identified it with pure consciousness which is truth and happiness. The Buddhists have called it Nirvana which means the ending of desire (Thrishna or Tanha) as desire is the cause of sorrow. Inner freedom is the cessation of sorrow (Dukha). The existentialists have equated inner freedom with the freedom of the consciousness from its essence. Freedom is the absence of determinism by the factors other than consciousness. Freedom is the determinism of consciousness by itself. It implies the precedence of consciousness over its essence. An existentialist
like Kierkegaard calls it subjectivity. He also calls it truth, which is beyond the objectivity of science. To him, freedom is a state of absolute certainty and definiteness in which the individual realises his true being. An existentialist like Sartre equates freedom with consciousness itself. Consciousness is free since it is not unconscious like a thing. Freedom implies the capacity of consciousness to question and to negate its 'object' endlessly. Sartre characterizes freedom with qualities like division, conflict, and unhappiness, and treats these characteristics as inalienable to freedom. He therefore, says that man is condemned to be free. Man can never overcome his state of unhappy freedom.

According to Marxism, freedom is not intellectual. It is not freedom of will without freedom of action. Freedom is not the freedom of the mind alone. Freedom in its real sense is both of the will and action. It is psychological as well as social. Man in order to be free has to understand not only the psychological motives of his action, but also the environmental or social factors. Freedom is the result of man's intellectual and material progress. It is not in isolation, nor is it individualistic and personal. Freedom is social. It is in society and through social institutions that man attains freedom. The essential feature of society is economic production. Economic production is possible through the cooperation of fellow human beings. Man is unfree alone. Economic production enables man to conform outer reality to his inner being. It is the economic production that gives man freedom. Christopher Caudwell says 'It is because of economic production that man' is free and
beasts are not. This is clear from the fact that economic production is the manipulation of, by means of agriculture, horse taming, road building, car construction, light, heating and other engineering, of the environment, conformably to men's will. Economic production enables man to do what he wills. Man can do what he wills, only with the help of others. Man ceases to be man without roads, food supplies, machines, houses, and clothes etc. Man's free will depends on economic production, because human consciousness is born of economic production which is the basis for the evolution of language, science and art. The freedom of man's acts therefore depends on his material level which is economic production. The more advanced the economic production the more the freedom of man. This notion of freedom is based on the notion that consciousness is the result of economic production. 24

Many people understand freedom in the sense of freedom from something or as an abstraction. In fact, freedom is the highest form of human existence. As it has been discussed in the earlier chapter, according to Krishnamurti, freedom is the total ending of thought at the psychological level since it is always in the realm of past. In other words, tradition is a hindrance to freedom. Freedom is choiceless awareness or perceiving what is, or 'truth'. To be free is to be clear, intelligent and

24 Ibid., p.65.
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rational. Freedom is an active and passionate state of mind which does not conform to or be conditioned by anything. It is self knowledge in action. It is activity of mind which springs from 'nothingness'. And he further maintains that when man is psychologically or internally free, it finds its expression in one's own relationships with ideas, things and people. Krishnamurti calls such freedom religious. It is also called by him as revolutionary. It keeps the world in order.

**Krishnamurti on Tradition. Modernity and Revolution.**

The modern world view is characterized by Universalism, Rationalism and Secularism. Modernity is opposed to the religious world view which is traditional. Tradition involves uncritical acceptance of the past which is in the form of dogmas, beliefs and scriptural authorities. Tradition is accumulated knowledge of the past which comes to its inheritors in the form of patterned thought or formula. Basically tradition is vested in religion and its irrational and mythical structures. Krishnamurti perceives tradition as essentially playing, a negative role in man's quest for truth. Tradition is dead knowledge which ultimately manifests itself as an idol, concept or belief. Tradition as conclusion encourages dependence on it and therefore ends the spirit of challenge involved in the quest for truth. It cannot face a new situation attentively, and creates attachment to the past which ultimately becomes a burden. It creates an authority to be obeyed. It results in conflict and disorder. Tradition is one of the causes of division and therefore conflict is inevitable. Krishnamurti maintains that tradition prevents free thinking, free inquiry, self discovery...
and self knowing from time to time. Tradition denies freedom. It prevents the mind from operating totally and attentively.

The traditional mind is a conditioned or programmed mind which works as a hurdle to insight or intelligence. In Krishnamurti’s words, "The background, the culture as the Catholic, as the Protestant, as the Communist, as the Socialist, as my family, is the centre from which one is looking. So long as one is looking at life from a particular point of view, or from a particular experience which one has cherished which is one's background, which is the 'me' one cannot see the totality."²⁵

It is argued that, contrary to tradition, modernity brings change in the attitudes, values and orientation of thinking and mental makeup of the individual to make him/her rational, secular, liberal, self conscious and self confident in a changing world. Modernity certainly involves a break with the past. Secularism, rationalism and Universalism are the main characteristics of modernity. Reasoning plays a predominant role to evaluate beliefs, opinions, dogmas etc., Modernity assumes that, scientific thinking should have precedence over emotions and non-rational thought. Modernity also involves changes in the socio-economic and political structures facilitating industrialization, urbanization, and democratization. From the

economic point of view, modernity involves reorientation of the social structure bringing about material prosperity through increasing expansion of the productive forces of society and by equitable distribution of wealth. In short, the modern world view is based on empirical and scientific knowledge, and is incompatible with the tradition on all important aspects of life. It can be summed up as:

modernity embraced the idea of progress and the break from history and tradition. It subscribed to a secular meaning, the demystification and desacrilization of knowledge and social organization. It lauded human creativity, scientific discovery and pursuit of individual excellence. It upholds the doctrines of equality, liberty and faith in human intelligence opened up by education and universal reason.  

It is argued by many that scientific understanding and domination of nature would secure freedom to man from scarcity and want. Besides, transformation of the individual and control over nature, rational forms of social organization and modes of thought would bring liberation from the irrationalities of myths, religion, superstition, arbitrary use of power and human frailties. As a result, the universal, eternal and immutable qualities of humanity will be revealed.

It is argued by some thinkers that there is a dichotomous opposition between tradition and modernity. Modernity is considered to be the anti-thesis to tradition. But many scholars for different reasons contested the view that there is any dichotomy between tradition and modernity. Also some nationalist thinkers questioned the dichotomy between the tradition and modernity. They attempted to construct the idea of modernity differently. They challenged the hitherto dominant perspectives on modernity. Nationalist thinkers argued that modernity which is equated with industrialization, scientific and technological advancement was limited to Western countries. The so called modernity suited colonial interests at the expense of the colonized. Keeping this view in mind, the rationale of modernity, which was put forward by the Western colonial countries, was questioned. Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj* in a fundamental sense, contested the above view. We can see in the thought of Gandhi a blend of tradition and modernity. He tried to integrate new patterns of thought and action on traditional culture. He attempted a merger of the three levels of Indian social system, viz., Social stratification, culture, and polity into a pattern so that the break down of Indian tradition could be averted. Gandhi's critique of Western civilization "was critique of modernity and his central argument is that no enduring alternative can be pursued unless that alternative negotiated to the skills, capacities and wisdom of people".

Another Indian contemporary thinker, Ambedkar, also tried to overcome the tradition-modernity dichotomy. The critique of the tradition is accompanied in Ambedkar by a refusal to accept ready-made alternatives manufactured in the West. His philosophy is essentially ethical and religious and he keeps away from Western thought. And at the same time, he attacked Hinduism and its claims as religion. His comment on Hinduism is illustrative of his position. "It is a misnomer to call it religion. Its philosophy is opposed to the very thing for which religion stands." Hence he considers Hinduism as anti-religious as for him, religion is love of truth. He upholds the moral basis of life while allowing critical reason to operate. He considers Buddhism as the only religion which can respond to the demands of modernity and culture. For him Buddhist teachings are infallible and they are not making a claim to supernatural origin or authority. Buddhist teachings, he believes, appeal to reason and experience. By holding on to religiousness, he transcends the tradition-modernity dichotomy.

"Ambedkar's conversion to Buddhism constitutes a bold attempt by a towering Indian thinker to transcend the tradition-modernity dichotomy which has a seductive grip on the colonial mind. He tried to thus create an alternative to a society which cannot be moved by the metropole ideology of secularism and finds it's traditional religion morally

reprehensible."

In this sense he is critical of modernity and highlighted that the priority of social reconstruction can not be achieved without taking into account the legacy of tradition. He further considers that legal and political institutions do not have the capacity to reconstruct social solidarity, and therefore tries to provide a social basis for the liberal and political ethos which does not mean an uncritical acceptance of Western modernity or indigenous traditionalism.

Though Krishnamurti does not fit into the above framework, the discussion regarding tradition-modernity dichotomy will help us to have a better understanding and estimation of Krishnamurti. Though Krishnamurti is not a nationalist thinker, we can see the continuity between the nationalists discussed above and Krishnamurti in so far as he questions the dominant conceptions of both tradition and modernity. Krishnamurti is opposed to the method of comparison; but it is useful to consider Krishnamurti's philosophy in the light of current debates on tradition-modernity. Krishnamurti tried to overcome the tradition-modernity dichotomy, and that is a major contribution made by him.

Krishnamurti totally rejects tradition and urges mankind to be free from tradition. Tradition is the product of thought and it is the continuity of the past. It cannot solve

any problems since the world, society and man are changing every moment. Krishnamurti observes that from time immemorial, mankind has been living a conditioned life, which is the continuation of the traditional mind. According to him the brain is million years old. It cannot operate intelligently and totally. Krishnamurti maintains that the traditional mind or old-mind should be wiped out to make the new brain function.

In rejecting tradition, Krishnamurti does not counterpose it to modernity, though we may see some of the modernist assumptions in his views. He maintains that there are no dualities and opposites. His only concern is that man should live with the present or with what is, without carrying the burden of the past over to the present or without any future expectations. One should be free of motives and ideals to follow. Man should be free from psychologically becoming something and for that man must live every moment. He should experience 'what is' from moment to moment without having any continuity. The human brain should be totally attentive and operate intelligently. In short, the mind should be empty, should be freed from prejudice, preconceived notions and traditions, so that creativity can take place.

Krishnamurti not only rejected tradition, which is built upon irrational structures, myths, dogmas, beliefs and their authority but also the reasoning or rationality which is the product of thought and psychological time. Therefore the question does not arise of seeing rationality or reasoning or partial insights in tradition. Krishnamurti makes a differentiation between the intellect and intelligence.
Intellect operates on the basis of reasoning or logic, and is the result of conditioning or programming of the mind. It is also limited and partial. We can't have total understanding through it. But intelligence is not a product of thought and time. The activity of intelligence is out of love and compassion. Intelligence operates when the mind is empty, or in a state of nothingness. The intelligent mind is totally attentive and works with full energy. Intelligence is freedom; it is freedom from the known, the past and the limitations of thought. An intelligent act is a creative act.

Krishnamurti observes that so far mankind lived in conflict, violence and suffering which is the nature of the traditional mind. The conditioned, programmed brain of man has created a society which is aggressive, violent, greedy, competitive, egocentric, and ambitious. So he urges us to see the necessity of a radical, and a complete change which can be called a fundamental, real and total revolution. There should be change in the brain cells, or in the psyche so that the mind can operate holistically and intelligently and that is what he calls revolution. For Krishnamurti, revolution is a state of being and it is a constant transformation of the psyche. It is revolution in consciousness. The revolutionary mind can may be called religious mind according to him. Therefore his main concern is with the change in human psyche, or its total transformation. While rejecting tradition, Krishnamurti is not in favor of creating an alternative, as for him, any alternative, ideal or ideology is an extension of the past in a different form.
As we have seen, it is generally argued by a number of scholars that change should be brought about through revolution or reform. Krishnamurti considers that reform cannot solve the problem. It is just old things put forward in a new mould, in a new pattern. And Krishnamurti's conception of revolution is quite different from revolution as we generally understand the term. He maintains that what is necessary is not a reform or revolution as we understood it, but a transformation through a total revolution, a renewal, a fundamental change in the structure of the consciousness itself. Krishnamurti's revolution is change in the inner psyche. In the words of Krishnamurti, "we are saying that human beings are now confronted with extraordinarily complex problems; and to meet them adequately there must be a total revolution in the very field of consciousness itself, in very structure and the cells of brain themselves."

Krishnamurti's revolution is not limited to any particular sphere of life. It encompasses the whole life and society. Therefore his revolution is not limited to legal, social, or merely economic spheres or outward revolution. Krishnamurti revolution is individualistic, not of the masses or collective. For him the individual is the world and the transformation of the individual consciousness is all that is needed for a total revolution to take place. He maintains that the responsibility for bringing a radical change in human condition lies on the individual himself and not on the
collective society or government or any other organization. Only insight can cause a mutation in brain cells. The change in inward psyche automatically manifests itself in the outward world. Only that brings new order. As Krishnamurti says:

Bloody revolution can never solve our problems. Only a profound inward revolution which alters all our values can create a different environment, an intelligent social structure, and such a revolution can be brought about only by you and me. No new order will arise until we individually breakdown our own psychological barriers and are free.  

Krishnamurti's philosophy can not be understood as mere individualism, it is reflexive individualism. He maintains that the individual only exists in relation to things, ideas and people. So the change in individual relationships is automatically reflected in the outer world and society.

We have seen that like Gandhi, Krishnamurti does not reconstruct tradition from a new prospective. There seems to be similarity between Ambedkar and Krishnamurti on certain issues. This similarity perhaps may be due to that both relate closely to Buddhist philosophy. At the same time, there is lot of difference between Krishnamurti and Ambedkar. Ambedkar is critical about tradition, he has felt that Hinduism does not stand for reasoning; so he feels Hinduism is not religion. After
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attacking Hinduism, he proposes Buddhism as an alternative which stands for religion. He maintains that religion is ethical. In a significant way, Ambedkar holds the legacy of tradition by embracing Buddhism.

Though Krishnamurti is in favor of a religious life, his sense of religion is no way traditional, or associated with any world religions. He has given a different meaning to religion. His religion is not to be understood in terms of any organized religion. Where as Ambedkar proposes Buddhism as a true religion, Krishnamurti's religion is humanistic and contradicts traditional and authoritative religions. His conception of religion does not follow any beliefs, idols, rituals and dogmas. Religious life is dynamic and it is the only intelligent way of living. There is no dominance, hierarchy or authority to follow in his conception of religion. It is full of love and compassion.

It is quite interesting to see that Krishnamurti is not only critical about tradition but also of scientific knowledge which is considered to be the basis for modernity. Krishnamurti accepted that scientific knowledge is useful to a certain extent but maintained that it cannot solve all the human problems since it is limited. He points at the dehumanizing face of science and technology. Scientific knowledge has the potential to solve certain issues, but at the same time it is used for the purpose of dominance and destruction; unless and until man changes. Therefore Krishnamurti is critical about both tradition and science. However one has to live with actuality, what is, from moment to moment totally.
Humanistic Religion:

According to Humanism the distinctive character of man is that he is a rational and spiritual being. He has the capacity for self transcendence and self awareness and an ability to project his mind into future. Humanism recognizes the human self as a cognising subject which knows itself as well as the external world.

For the better understanding of Krishnamurti's views on religion it is better to have a understanding of what religion means according to humanism.

Humanistic religion is centred around man and has no concern for transcendence. It insists on man achieving full knowledge about himself. Humanistic religion does not advocate pessimism and ascetic renunciation. It is opposed to authoritative and traditional religions. In authoritative religion, man surrenders himself to some higher, unseen power, and is totally governed by it. According to Erich Fromm:

Humanistic religion ....is centred around man and his strength. Man must develop his power of reason in order to understand himself, his relationship to his fellow men and his position in the universe. He must recognize truth, both with regard to his limitations and his potentialities. He must develop his power of love for
other as well as for himself, and experience the solidarity of all living beings.\textsuperscript{32}

Religious experience according to humanistic religion is man's experience of oneness with all. It is based on one's relatedness to the world which he comes to know through his thought and love. Humanistic religion, concerns the human goal of life which is to achieve greatest strength, but not greatest powerlessness. According to it self realization, is the greatest virtue but not obedience and surrender as in authoritative religion. It is the realization of ones own potentiality.

One of the best examples of humanistic religion is early Buddhism. Buddha, recognizes the truth about human existence and does not speak in the name of any supernatural power but in the name of reason. Zen buddhism, is a better expression of humanistic religion and many of the views of Krishnamurti are strikingly similar to Zen buddhism.

According to Zen Budhism, knowledge is of no value unless it grows out of man's understanding of himself. No authority, no teacher can really teach us anything except to create doubts in us. Systems of thought are dangerous because they easily turn out to be authoritative. Therefore life itself must be grasped and experienced.

Erich Fromm tried to trace the elements of humanistic religion in the young Marx's writing and his socialism. Marx's concept of socialism is a protest, as is all existentialist philosophy, against the alienation of man. His socialism is a protest against the lovelessness and against man's exploitation of man. As Aldous Huxley puts it, "our present economic, social and international arrangements are based, in large measure, upon organized lovelessness." The socialism is exactly against the loveless nature of man. And an unalienated man is one who does not dominate nature, but who becomes one with it. "Does not all this mean that Marx's socialism is the realization of the deepest religious impulses common to the great humanistic religions of past?"

Marx fought against religion exactly because it alienates man from his own reality and does not satisfy the true needs of man. Marx's fight against God is, in reality, a fight against the idol that is called God which is created by religion. Young Marx wrote as the motto for his dissertation, "Not those are godless who have contempt for the Gods of the masses but those who attribute the opinions of the masses to the Gods."
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Eric Fromm considers Marx's atheism as the most advanced form of rational mysticism, close to Meister Eckhart or to Zen Buddhism than most of those who fight for god and religion and accuse Marx of 'Godlessness'.

Krishnamurti's views are centred around humanism when he talks about religion. He refutes the false notions about religion, and God. He questions the irrational attitudes dogmas and beliefs of human beings and at the same time he does not want to give a new meaning to the old. Since he totally rejects the tradition as a whole for fresh, creative life, his religious revolution is not revival or reformation of any particular religion. The total freedom from all religions and ideologies which he advocates means, in fact, freedom from the society as it is the society which has created them.

Is Krishnamurti a mystic?

It is debatable whether Krishnamurti is a mystic or not. Some people consider Krishnamurti as a kind of mystic and for others he is no mystic and there is no mystic element in his teaching. Then what is mysticism? What is its significance?

Mysticism brings to man intimations of those layers of consciousness, which are still subjective to him, that is, those on which he does not normally function. In fact, the level of consciousness just above his normal consciousness is truly the realm of mysticism.

It is said that when the world is in crisis there is scope for the emergence of mystic thought, or mystic thought helps in making religion meaningful and thus saves it. With the emergence of positivism in modern time the traditional ideas and values are questioned and discarded. This is more so in the case of religion. Religious beliefs and values are criticised in the wake of advancement in science and philosophy. Modern attitude towards religion is one of skepticism. And mysticism is seen to be meaningful in meeting the challenge to religion as mysticism is basically experiential. So many people look to mysticism for help and Enlightenment as mysticism provides a renewed religious life. And the favorable inclination of modern man towards mystics and their teaching is to help him overcome the stress of modern life and civilization. It appears that a new spiritual impulse comes into the life of humanity through new forms of mysticism. Mysticism reveals a higher level of consciousness which is above the normal consciousness of man.

According to Rohit Mehta, "He (Krishnamurti) is, thus a mystic of an extraordinary type, for he cannot be fitted into any class of known mystic of the past or the present, and yet his approach to life is intensely mystical. He is a person who shows paradoxical tendencies in his life and action." And he further says that, "His (Krishnamurti) mysticism may be termed Intellectual Mysticism or the mysticism of the mind. His is an
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intuitive approach and deals with the intuition of the mind—a state in which the human mind is illumined by that which is beyond the mind."\(^{39}\)

However Rohit Mehta, considers that in one respect it is not right to call Krishnamurti's approach intuitive, for we know nothing about intuition—which is beyond mind. But there is no other better word which can mean that faculty which is beyond mind, and at the same time cannot be conceptualized. But Krishnamurti is not happy with the word intuition to describe his approach. Though he uses the term intuition, occasionally, for him, there is nothing mystical about the state of intuition. It is the state in which total perception takes place, and the observer is observed. It is the realization of non-duality and the act of intelligence. In one of his conversations, Krishnamurti says:

Intuition is the highest point of intelligence and to me keeping alive that intelligence is inspiration. Now, you can only keep alive that intelligence, of which intuition is the highest expression, by experience, by being all the time like a questioning child. Intuitions, the apotheosis, the culmination, the accumulation of intelligence.

\(^{39}\)Ibid., p.286.

Thus according to Krishnamurti, intuition is the state of intelligence and is beyond intellect. It is the contact of actuality or reality in a direct manner without the interpreting medium of the mind. Henri Bergson also talks about intuition which is a faculty of consciousness, and is capable of knowing the reality as a whole. Zen Buddhism also insists on knowing the reality from a point which is beyond intellect. Such knowing or satori is an unimpeded flow, and means understanding the totality of things or knowing reality as a whole or in its completeness. It is the experience of reality itself without an interpretation. We will be able to perceive life from a new standpoint when the process of the mind is completely eliminated. It is an intuitive understanding of life. Krishnamurti's position is similar to the above, as according to him life manifests and fulfils itself in action every moment. He maintains that to know the truth as a whole, or to have complete experience one should overcome or transcend all the ideas, dogmas that is imposed upon truth by the mind.

In the words of Krishnamurti, "My teaching is neither mystic nor occult" and he further affirms that, "for I hold that both mysticism and occultism are man's limitation upon truth. Life is more important than any belief or dogmas, and in order to allow life fruition you must liberate it from beliefs, authority and tradition. But those who are bound by these things will have a difficulty in understanding truth."

---
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It was also pointed out that, Krishnamurti's views on truth are like the mysticism of the Upanishads and Buddhism. But Krishnamurti refuses to call his teaching mystical. Truth according to him is not other worldly. It is neither mysterious nor complicated. He further says that its knowledge is not the privilege of a few. It is accessible to all. It does not mean accumulation of knowledge and is not unrelated to daily life—Truth is life itself. It is in the immediate present and can be known instantaneously. Truth may, however, appear to be mysterious to the mind which is burdened with past knowledge. But it cease to be so the moment the mind becomes free from such knowledge and perceives Truth directly. Krishnamurti contends that truth would be insignificant if it were to be mystical and accessible only to a few. Therefore reducing Krishnamurti's philosophy to mysticism is to ignore its simplicity, directness, universality and its relevance to the daily life of man.

**Krishnamurti and His Teachings:**

The core of Krishnamurti's philosophy is the direct realization of truth which is possible by ending thought. According to him a different kind of mind and life are possible only when thought with its traditional content is completely put to an end. The entire teaching of Krishnamurti is directed towards the sole task of ending thought. Time and again he emphasizes the possibility of the cessation of thought. The biologists and psychologists maintain that thought is the
essential characteristic of the mind or the brain. What food is to the body, thought is to the mind. Man is biologically-constrained to think as long as he is alive. But Krishnamurti strongly rejects this idea. He holds that thought is not an inherent and inalienable characteristic of the brain or mind. It is only tradition and the habit that have made thought essential to brain. But Krishnamurti maintains that it is possible to stop thought by understanding its genesis. Krishnamurti is of the view that it is only the conditioned mind which thinks that it is impossible to end thought. It is only the sluggish, the dull and the lazy mind that accepts thought as its inseparable characteristic. But the mind which can observe itself choicelessly can discover that it is possible to end thought. Krishnamurti therefore says that the very assertion that it is impossible to end thought strengthens thought and such a thinking is a barrier to an inquiry into the nature of thought.

The question is often asked whether Krishnamurti lived up to his teachings or not. Many people admit that Krishnamurti's teachings can be understood better by observing Krishnamurti and his life. As one who understood truth, Krishnamurti lived truth in his daily life. He was a man who conquered division, conflict, attachment and sorrow. He was also known as man or Lord of love and compassion. He lived the inexpressible truth better than he expressed it in his teachings. Krishnamurti himself says that it is difficult to express the inexpressible truth in words. Truth is beyond verbalization. On the contrary some believe that there was a gap between the life of Krishnamurti and his teaching, or that Krishnamurti failed to live his teachings perfectly. To this criticism Krishnamurti
answered that he was only a medium through which the truth expressed itself. As a man Krishnamurti is unimportant but his life is revealing as a medium of truth. His life is like a mirror in which everyone can see themselves as they are. The mirror is not so important. As Krishnamurti says, his teaching is more important than himself. Therefore one has to take his teaching more seriously than his life.