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Jiddu Krishnamurti is a well-known great thinker of our times. Several attempts have been made to characterize the teachings of J. Krishnamurti or to identify his thought in terms of the known classifications of thought like religious, philosophical, psychological etc. It is really a problem to characterize Krishnamurti's thought either as philosophical, or religious or psychological. How to characterize Krishnamurti's thought? Is it a kind of philosophy dealing with some general problems of philosophy like the nature and meaning of human existence? Is Krishnamurti a free thinker generally concerned with the decline of moral values? Are his writings psychological explanation of human behavior related especially to religion and spirituality? Or is his thought religious with a view to reconciling the traditional religions with the modern thought which is influenced and shaped by reason and positive sciences? Or can we say that his thought is revolutionary in nature, that is to say, his intention is to bring about a radical change in human attitudes and ways of thinking?

Krishnamurti himself does not want to be classified in terms of any traditional categories as he thinks such classification of himself and his thought would be rigid and reductionistic. We

See Appendix for a brief biographical sketch of J. Krishnamurti.
find him making a constant effort to keep himself away from traditionally accepted roles and labels which are parochial as he is basically a universal man, and his thought is not addressed to any one community, nation or tradition.

According to Krishnamurti the nature of definition is such that it overlooks the richness of the thing defined, and therefore to define human life in terms of certain categories is to miss the richness of life and its integral character. For him, there is no distinction between human life, thought and action. One thing that is true about Krishnamurti, is that he is interested in human existence and its problems. These themes run through all his teachings and writings. He is more concerned with the problems related to truth, freedom, self-knowledge and revolution. And in dealing with or discussing these problems, he has not identified himself with any particular viewpoint or school of thought, nor does he claim to have propounded a new theory or philosophy about anything. For him reflective understanding must not ignore or overlook to take note of the uniqueness of the situation which may happen when one adheres to certain static notions and theories.

We began our introduction with a set of questions which one would normally like to pose in order to situate or identify a thinker. But what is more important, according to Krishnamurti, is not the problems which these questions address but the manner in which one approaches these problems. The traditional way of understanding these problems may not be adequate and inspiring. One must rethink these issues not by caricaturing the traditional
understanding of them as it is often done but by revisiting them in their own freshness. It will be not only paradoxical but even futile to approach Krishnamurti's thought and analysis in terms of already defined terminologies and accepted modes of analysis. The holism that we find in his reflections is not amenable to any kind of reduction, nor can it be appreciated in terms of any binary poles of opposition.

He is not a philosopher in academic or technical terms as he does not indulge in arguments and proofs, nor is he interested in maintaining coherence of thought or in system building. He is also not interested in conceptualization. Questions about epistemology or ontology are of least interest for him. For instance, to debate over the cognitive status of values are to indulge in a controversy over the primacy of mind or matter which is to miss the point. The problems with which Krishnamurti is mainly concerned are those by which human beings live, and therefore if at all we want to conceive a purpose and goal to his thought, it is to emancipate human spirit from all types of conditioning. Therefore it is necessary for anyone to understand and appreciate the thought of Krishnamurti that he should dispense with normally accepted philosophical techniques and categories and to face the issues directly without too much indulging in conceptualization etc. Most of the philosophical concepts are not free from presuppositions and even prejudices peculiar to the system of philosophy or to the thinker who formulated them. For instance many of the ideas we have about the world, human existence and social system to which we belong are mostly inherited from the tradition which we accept without
subjecting them to any kind of critical scrutiny. Because of these reasons Krishnamurti emphasizes on looking at the problems and understanding them afresh, so that the various ideas and values are not taken for granted.

Though as a creative thinker, he has drawn the attention of the people all over the world, he is not taken seriously by the academic community. Though we cannot classify him in the sense we classify academic philosophers, yet he may be regarded as a 'philosopher of life' or of human spirit. If we understand the meaning of philosophy in the classical sense as a quest for wisdom, then Krishnamurti is definitely a philosopher.

We find that Krishnamurti's thought is well informed by some of the age old debates in the history of philosophy. We may even characterize him as a free and creative thinker who tried to reconcile the wisdom of East and West. There is something new in his thought which may shed light on the controversy between materialism and idealism. Though he is not a materialist or an idealist in the accepted sense, yet he has something new to offer in understanding the controversy between materialism and idealism. However the implications of his thought may prove helpful and even insightful in understanding some of the problems of philosophy. As pointed out earlier he is not generally concerned with the problems with which the academic philosophers are generally concerned. He has not generally bothered himself to revisit or re-interpret the traditional philosophical problems. One may find meaningful solutions from his thought to some of the philosophical problems, but that is not the main
concern of his thought. For instance the following statement of Krishnamurti on the controversy between idealism and materialism will justify our observation. "Idealism is an escape from what is, and materialism is another way of denying the measureless depths of the present. Both idealists and materialists have their own ways of avoiding the complex problems of 'suffering; both are consumed by their own craving, ambitions and conflicts and their ways of life are not conducive to tranquility. They are both responsible for the confusion and misery of the world".2

Krishnamurti thinks that in the process of inquiry into any problem concerning human existence, a commitment to any of the existing views would naturally lead to a partial or non-integral understanding of the problem. Therefore one must suspend one's judgment about any problem and try to be just aware of the problem. The suspension of judgment is therefore a precondition for all inquiry. One must be wholesome or integral in his approach otherwise one may miss the truth. For instance, if one wants to understand the nature of one's own reality one should take in to consideration his conscious and unconscious mind. A suspension of judgment would lead to real self-knowledge which is what Krishnamurti calls the beginning of intelligence. Therefore all our inquiries must be free from preconceived and inherited notions and one must approach any problem with great amount of care and spontaneity.

We are at the threshold of the twenty first century. No one can deny the fact that there has been an unprecedented advance in science and technology. 'Even as we make certain claims about the progress that has been achieved we experience a sense of loss or decline in certain aspects of human life and civilization. On the one hand there is a definite change in our living conditions while on the other the humankind is engulfed in a series of ideological battles whether they be religious, political or economic. Then in what sense we can assert that our civilization has achieved progress? What does it then mean to say that we have more knowledge about, the nature, of the world and of man than ever before? Can we accept without any reservation or unconditionally the claim about progress? We cannot deny the fact that the fragmentation of humanity into caste, class, nation, religion, ethnic groups is also unprecedented. Human beings are leading their lives not in a state of joy but with a constant fear of being destroyed. Mankind seems to be obsessed with the idea of domination which expresses itself in various forms like amassing wealth, monopolizing trade and colonizing nations. And domination is carried out with the help of certain institutions which are supposed to serve as custodians of moral life. Life is no more an expression of joy but a vulgar display of human weaknesses resulting in the increase of human suffering. We find ourselves involved in activities that are really meaningless, and at the same time we feel ourselves helpless to free ourselves from such situation.
That humanity is facing a deep rooted crisis, is not a recent revelation, and that there is a crisis is one thing on which all the creative thinkers agree. The symptoms were recognized long before and there have been many attempts to emancipate man from such a situation. But there is no unanimity or agreement among thinkers about the nature of the crisis and the way to overcome it. People from all walks of life like scientists, economists, spiritual leaders and political thinkers are concerned with the problem, and their analysis of the situation and also their attempts to solve it are helpful in understanding the complexities of the situation. However the failure in overcoming the crisis is partly because the various thinkers are not clear in their diagnosis of the fundamental problem, and therefore their solutions are not comprehensive and lasting. For instance, the economic solution to the problem is limited as human beings cannot be explained in terms of economics alone. The core of the problem lies in understanding the human nature in its totality. According to Krishnamurti, a solution to the crisis would emerge not from politics or religion but from the insights about the human mind or psyche and also from understanding the nature of human consciousness. And to understand the nature of man we have to comprehend the nature of human consciousness. Therefore Krishnamurti gives more importance or pays more attention in understanding the nature of human consciousness. However, Krishnamurti's attempt to characterize the nature of human consciousness is not the first of its kind; there have been many such attempts before. But what distinguishes Krishnamurti from others is his way of perceiving the problem. Krishnamurti feels that our inquiry must begin with
an understanding of our tradition which has supplied us with a number of notions and attitudes that we cherish. He, however, feels that the various solutions that have come to us are conditioned by the tradition, and our past. The tradition, whatever may be its structure, can offer us only a partial view of the problem and therefore any attempt to offer a solution based on it would inevitably be conditioned by the limitations of the tradition. Krishnamurti would therefore like to encourage us to explore the psychological reasons behind the crisis which, according to him, would alone bring about emancipation of human intelligence and creativity from the limitations, authority and fear of tradition.

So far we have made an attempt to present some of the basic features of his thought, and what follows is an attempt to highlight the problem that forms the focus of my study. Along with stating the problem of my dissertation I also try to point out the limitations of previous attempts by others. Two broad areas in which Krishnamurti's thought has its significant impact are education and human freedom. What forms the core of my dissertation are his ideas on tradition and revolution which so far have not received due attention. The problem of tradition and revolution is one of the most important or crucial problems that Krishnamurti has tried to analyze and understand in his writings as well as in his talks. Living in the 20 century, one finds it extremely difficult to ignore one's past. At the same time we also realize that the past which comes to us in the form of tradition has conditioned us and our ways looking at and understanding things. Therefore it is essential for us to be
clear about the terms on which we can spell out the terms of negotiation with the past in understanding our place in and relation to the tradition. Moreover, the emerging world order also makes us to rethink about our relation to past. Thinkers of various ideological persuasions have tried to address themselves to this problem in their own ways. The object of ray dissertation is two fold. Firstly, to discuss the various ideologies like Marxism, different versions of liberalism and religion in general with a view to understanding their approaches to the problem of tradition and revolution as well as their understanding of the problem. Secondly, an attempt is made to understand Krishnamurti's understanding of the problem of tradition and revolution and to present and discuss his views on the problem in a systematic manner. The second is the major thrust of my dissertation to which the first serves as a backdrop or introduction.

Tradition represents the past that is carried over into the present in the form of ideas, beliefs and images. Tradition prescribes certain norms and conventions, and stands for certain values which are transmitted from one generation to another. Tradition is not static but something which moves or flows in one form or other and is ingrained into contemporary thinking and practice. Revolution, on the other hand aims at breaking away with the past or tradition and encourages constant questioning before accepting anything. Its object is to emancipate humanity from the past and its conditioning, and to create a new world order. It tries to free humankind from the burden of tradition, so that the creative human energy finds intelligent expression.
By helping in creating a new social order based on human equality, it aims at putting an end to the exploitative structure of the traditional society. Thus we see that tradition and revolution are not completely unrelated, though tradition and revolution are related as 'self' and the 'other'. Tradition tries to negotiate with revolution by appropriating it, revolution demands a total break from tradition. For Krishnamurti, tradition is something one has to do away with in order to bring about a new world order. According to him thought serves as a medium for the continuity of tradition. By the same token one may say that it tries to perpetuate the traditional values and ideas. Krishnamurti views thought as a response of our memory that is conditioned to our modern challenges and situation. Such a response would therefore be both incomplete and inadequate. An inadequate response would only help in strengthening the process of conditioning of our minds.

The values, ideas and beliefs inherited from the tradition inhibit spontaneous response and free action as they condition our thinking and attitudes. Therefore they do not enable us to strike a new path or to think creatively and afresh. As Krishnamurti says, "Knowledge, belief, conviction, conclusion and experience are hindrances to truth; they are the very structure of the self".³

Knowledge, involving thought, does not encourage independence. It hinders the possibility of seeing and experiencing things afresh. The different kinds of knowledge that we have are rooted in tradition and are therefore incomplete and limited. Its possibilities are also limited. For these reasons, Krishnamurti equates knowledge with tradition. We generally feel a sense of optimism about human situation with the advancement in science and technology. But to reduce human activity to science and technology is to limit human nature and its possibilities. Science and technology are due to a kind of human human endeavor and imagination. Therefore their claim to solve all the problems under the sun must be suspected. Nevertheless these arguments against the grand claims of science and technology are not meant to reject the importance of science and technology totally. Krishnamurti does not fail to acknowledge the progress that sciences have made and their value and importance to the progress of humankind. But the knowledge that sciences provide must be utilized with great amount of caution.

According to Krishnamurti, the emancipation of mankind from the crisis requires overcoming the past and its ways of thinking and understanding. To substantiate his position, Krishnamurti considers religion at length to throw light on the human crisis. Generally religion is seen as the custodian of moral values and as final authority and solution with regard to human life and its problems. However as the science makes great advance, we find that religion of different kinds losing their hold and authority over human life. Science has done us a great favor by
questioning the beliefs upheld by different religions. In the modern world science has replaced religion as the final authority. But science has failed to alleviate human misery and suffering. One may even say that it has succeeded only in making human life more miserable. Communism is another major attempt to break away from all existing traditions. It envisages a social order which will be conducive to human welfare, free from all domination and exploitation. However, with the collapse of the Soviet Union and other east European countries, thinkers have started characterizing communism as a false prophecy.

Another tendency that we witness in today's world is a journey back to tradition, and to an extent traditions are being 'invented' to serve certain political goals. Identities are asserted with the help of traditions. This tendency is exemplified in the various movements that address the problem of cultural identity. The attempts to revive tradition have given rise to a much more complex problem of confrontation between traditional values and secular form of life. In this context it may not be far from truth to say that secularism, is also rooted in the past. One can definitely argue that secularism motivated by humanism, accepts rationality and tolerance for granted. Various notions like rationality and tolerance may themselves be motivated by not so apparent ideologies. Thus we find that both the models (tradition and secularism) are equally problem ridden.

These problems are not however, being talked about for the first time. But what differentiates Krishnamurti from others is his way of approach. He makes it very clear that ideologies,
religions, and the so called social reforms cannot bring about any substantive change in the existing situation. While attempting to provide a solution, he raises a few pertinent questions. Is the brain conditioned by scriptures, economic structures and other forms of ideologies? And if the brain presents us with a continuity, can we put an end to it? Can the brain be free of psychological time? Is it possible for the brain to be totally free from memory or tradition? Is the brain capable of bringing about its own transformation? If the brain cells are keepers of memory of the tradition, then is it possible to transform the brain in order to get away from the conditioning memory? Does the brain have mechanisms to carry this out?

Krishnamurti feels that all these questions are not without solutions. The solution basically lies in transforming the very structure of human consciousness, which according to him is real 'revolution'. This change or transformation should take place in each and every cell of our brain. The revolution must take place spontaneously, and in the present moment. It can happen only when the brain is totally free of all patterns and dominating structures. And that puts an end to the continuity of time which is the carrier of the past. Thus a mind which is capable of transforming itself, faces the challenge from moment to moment. And such a change and transformation enables us to be aware and experience love, compassion and human relationships in an altogether different light. Thus the revolution in the individual brains or minds would automatically bring about a change in the world order.
Krishnamurti left behind a huge collection of writings and audio-visual records of his teachings. My study is concerned mainly with the teachings of post-realization period, i.e., from 1927 to 1986. However, one may find only a change in his expression during this period but not in the essence of his teaching, that is to set man absolutely and unconditionally free.

The thesis consists of five chapters, a brief summary of which is given below.

The first chapter, 'On Tradition' is a discussion of some of the views of important thinkers about tradition that have come down to us. This discussion provides a significant background for the exposition of Krishnamurti's views on the same problem. Such a discussion enables us to have a clear understanding of the issue involved. The role of tradition in our day to day life is highlighted. Krishnamurti holds that man is a product of tradition as well as its guardian. He defends it and strengthens it by his own contributions. Taking up different examples like family, religion, nation and moral values, I tried to discuss, how they act as barriers in attaining a clear understanding of the human nature. The discussion of Krishnamurti's views in this chapter is in no way exhaustive. My effort is only to introduce his thoughts along with the thought of other prominent thinkers who made significant contribution to the problem.
In continuation with the first, the second chapter entitled 'Traditional Mind' probes further into the problem of tradition as viewed by Krishnamurti. It focuses its attention on the 'operations of the mind' under the influence of tradition. Traditional mind is viewed as a product of psychological evolution, and as a shadow of certain images, formulae and conclusions that find their expression in thought. It is argued that the creation of 'I' is instrumental in the affirmation of certain notions. The role of thought in this process is analyzed along with a discussion on the construction of certain structures of consciousness which are its correlate. Time, knowledge, memory and thought form a unit, and condition the mind. They shape the very structure of mind, which Krishnamurti calls conditioning. Such a conditioning, according to Krishnamurti, results in inability to respond creatively to different problems humans face in their day to day life. A conditioned mind fails to perceive the truth as a whole. This is because the tradition supplies the mind with a sense of security which it does not want to forego in favor of adventure and freedom. Traditional mind by its very nature is fragmented, divisive and full of conflicts. It is rooted in fear, envy, insecurity and jealousy. The discussion about the operation of traditional mind paves the way for a detailed analysis of its implications in giving rise to a world order.

The third chapter is titled 'World Disorder and Traditional Revivalism'. It begins with a discussion on the predicament of modern age that is reflected in personal relationships, politics and a disbelief in the claims of science, technology and religion.
The fragmented responses of a conditioned mind only succeed in the revival certain traditions. The emphasis on cultural identity is one among many identities. The argument for revivalism results in the 'closing of the mind'. Religions with a long history and political ideologies have failed to make sense of the situation. War and fragmentation of nations, only affirm the point further. According to Krishnamurti, the root of the problem lies in the structure of the human consciousness. The political turmoils that we witness all over the world are only individual's mental conflicts writ large. One can not draw a clear line of demarcation between the individual and society. Both contribute mutually for sustenance. As the world according to Krishnamurti, is an extension of human consciousness, the fundamental problem has to do with the very structure of the human psyche. The outer is the manifestation of the inner. This chapter also discusses the tendency, more explicit today than ever before, to invent 'traditions' in order to find answers to various problems. This becomes clear in the context of various movements that argue for particular traditions and identities. Religious fundamentalism and nationalism are discussed to understand and illustrate the problem. The chapter ends with a discussion on Krishnamurti's attempt to understand human life as a whole in order to facilitate the emergence of a solution.

The first three chapters deal with the formulation of the problem. The fourth chapter entitled "On Revolution" discusses the possibility of a 'way' out. "Revolution" is seen as an answer. I begin the chapter with a discussion of the different views on revolution held by different thinkers and move on to an
elaborate discussion of Krishnamurti's views. According to Krishnamurti, the solution does not lie in the application of a certain model, but in bringing about a fundamental change. A clear understanding of the structure of contemporary society and mind are prerequisites. Revolutions of the past, political or scientific, have only brought about piecemeal reforms. What is necessary is a radical and complete change. For Krishnamurti, revolution involves a complete and radical transformation of human psyche. Political systems or moral institutions are incapable of bringing this about. It demands a complete rejection of dominated structures and an integration of human psyche. Such revolution, according to Krishnamurti, means an end to the continuity of time that carries tradition within itself. Revolution, in this sense is not something that is to be realized in future. It must take place 'here' and 'now'. It is not time bound. It is marked by the absence of thought, memory and time. It is characterized as 'choiceless awareness' that realizes 'freedom'. A mind that is capable of bringing about such a revolution is what he calls an 'intelligent mind'. An intelligent mind, according to him, is free and therefore capable of perceiving the reality as a whole. It is both silent and meditative. He calls it, a 'religious mind' in the true sense of the term. It lives in freedom and is free from fear and anxiety. It experiences love and compassion with freshness, and that marks the beginning of wisdom.

The final chapter begins with a discussion of the implications of psychological revolution to self-knowledge. An attempt is also made to argue a case for change in the global
relationships that would be devoid of war and violence. The revolution must be at the level of individual psyche. Only then a radical change at the collective level can be brought about. Such a revolution, Krishnamurti says, will establish a new world order. To make the discussion fruitful I follow Krishnamurti's distinction between reality which is a product of the psychological time and Truth which is ending of past and beginning of intelligence. He equates truth with 'nothingness'. But his notion of nothingness has very little similarity with that of Sartre and other existentialists. After a brief discussion of views on Brain, Mind and Cognition, I take up a comparison of Krishnamurti's project with some of the major philosophers both Eastern and Western. Thinkers like Plato, Marx, Freud, Sartre and Buddhist philosophy are discussed in order to show how Krishnamurti goes beyond them, though his thought has something in common with them.

Krishnamurti has contributed to the debate on tradition and modernity in his own characteristic way. He finds that both of them are equally problematic and must therefore be rejected. While rejecting tradition, Krishnamurti does not counter pose 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 the present or with what is. I discuss his views on tradition and modernity, along with that of Gandhi and Ambedkar, two of the most prominent contemporary Indian thinkers. Krishnamurti is more close to Ambedkar than Gandhi in some respects though he goes much farther than the former substantially. In the second last section I
argue that Krishnamurti's notion of religion is a humanistic one. To give an example, one may point towards Zen Buddhism or the ideas that we find in the early writings of Marx. I conclude the chapter with a recapitulation of the controversy about characterizing Krishnamurti as a mystic. In all these discussions I have tried to take an independent stance in contrast to the dominant and most prevailing views on Krishnamurti. Such a critical study I hope would at least bring to light the relevance of Krishnamurti to the contemporary world.