CHAPTER VI

A CRITICAL UNDERSTANDING OF J. KRISHNAMURTI

I. Important features of Krishnamurti's concept of Religion and Philosophy of Religion.

II. Ultimate Doubts.
In the last two chapters we have discussed Krishnamurti's criticism of religion, and his positive views on religion. Criticism is the destruction of traditional faiths while his positive view is the description of emergence of a new religious mind through self-knowledge. For Krishnamurti, they are not separate operations. The very destruction of temples, is new religion. The self knowing is the destruction of the old and the construction of the new.

It may be said from the discussions in the previous chapters that Krishnamurti's concept of true religion is unique. It is entirely different from traditional religion and, in principle, it can be only a real universal religion.

(i) With Krishnamurti the whole conception of religion takes a new form. Traditional religions are associated with beliefs, theologies, rituals and ceremonies. Krishnamurti takes a religion which is stripped of all such essences. In fact only in the absence of these formal features there is the true religion. The true religion according to him has no theology, no dogma, no temples, no ceremonies, no gurus, no saints. These are all obstacles in the way of being religious. A real religious mind is absolutely free from all these conditioning factors and all limitations of dogma. In this age of science the influences of religions which require their followers to believe in incomprehensible
things is naturally waning. Most rational and scientifically minded people find it difficult to accept such beliefs. Even though the religions are becoming less and less dogmatic in their attitudes during their development, they are not as yet free from all dogmatism and theology. They stick to the minimum theology but this also is a limitation. Krishnamurti's religion is not limited by any such belief. It is absolutely free; therefore it has universality.

(ii) Krishnamurti's approach to religion is radically different. He does not see holiness, sacredness in prayer worship or traditional meditation but according to him the highest love, beauty, virtue are sacred. 'His is religion of love and compassion. This love flowers when one is completely free from all traditions, past culture and religions. That love is not attachment to an individual, nation, religion, or ideology. It is impersonal. Virtue and beauty merge in that love. Krishnamurti feels that the world problems are to be solved by love and compassion and not by violence and separation. That love which can save humanity is sacred. Religion is not different from love.

Krishnamurti's religion has love as its essence; it is love and compassion itself. It is love in freedom, love that is not bound by a person, god or a principle. An organised religion has its roots in fear. It has nothing but fear as its essence. These religions aim at personal salvation. Though they give the message of universal love, they do not
make their followers love, because, firstly, love cannot be cultivated and secondly because, since the followers accept religion out of fear, they cannot have love. Fear breeds cruelty. Therefore there is always hatred, competition, killing and violence in these religions. We have innumerable instances of cruelty in religions. Love for, that is attachment to, religion, separates people, and causes hatred and wars. There is compassion and competition in religions but in love there is no striving and there is no competition, "Love is neither perfect nor imperfect. Love never tries after something. It is the flame without and smoke". Religion seeks continuity; love does not; "Love has no tomorrow. It has no promise no hope. It lives and dies each minute." Love is not escape from what is; to live with what is is love; it is religion and not the escape in seclusion. To escape is the result of fear to face 'what is'. Fear is bondage; it leads to slavery of authority of god, religion, ideas. Love does not project ideas and become slave of the beliefs. Love is secure and complete in itself. "Freedom and love go together." One who really loves is liberated. Thus Krishnamurti's religion is the religion of love and compassion. One does not have to follow any particular faith and his love is not for any section of the mankind but it is total. "Love is not to be divided --- love gives itself abundantly as flower gives its perfume. Love is of whole earth,—the love of reality is not encompassed by any religion and when organised
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Compassion is "passion for everyone." Action and love are not separate. A mind which is full of love is itself energy. "The religious mind is the explosion of love." But this religious state of mind, which transcends thought, mind is not mysterious or mystical, that creates science and technology, but it does not contradict science. The religious mind which is full of compassion uses science with love of mankind.

(iii) The traditional religions as they require people to accept beliefs always confronted with science while Krishnamurti's religion, since it does not, as compatible with scientific outlook.

Religions by nature are conservative and sciences are always advancing. Religions take time to accept any new fact discovered by sciences and therefore there is always conflict between science and religion.

Science and religion often come face to face in argument because many of their objects of enquiry, are supposed to be the same but their interpretations are different; for example both science and the traditional religions are interested in the investigations of origin of the life, earth, universe, the nature of soul, mind, the relation of matter and spirit, but their methods are different.

Religions propound various theories of creation and the origin of the world. Man tries to find significance and purpose of his life based on those assumptions. If god creates the

2. Ibid., p.199
universe the god might have some purpose. Whatever might be the purpose, man as a sentient being becomes responsible to fulfill his duty towards the god. Therefore his life is guided by his commitments, his devotion to god. The meaning and significance of life are founded on those commitments, in those beliefs. In Indian religions, theory of Karm plays an important role in directing life, and the day of judgement directs the life in Islam and Christianity. Life is based on beliefs. Trigg says, "If I commit myself to God I base my life on my belief that there is God."¹

The significance of life or its direction is different if one does not have such beliefs and superstitions. He may accept the scientific theories of origin of earth and life on it. He will not believe that god has created the heaven and earth with its content in a week or in a moment, but he will believe that earth has taken millions of years to reach the present form. Life is a chance emergence on this planet; amino acids are the building blocks of life; life emerged as one-celled animal and took millions of years to develop into a complex being while adapting with the environment. It has separated from the physical world and undergo changes, while the physical world has not changed in the same way. According to Darwin life improves human form and its extra-ordinary brain are the results of evolution. Scientists are trying to explain the world around depending on their observations, sense experiences, evidences and logical inferences. In the process of evaluation how man has

¹ Trigg, Reason and Commitment, p.43
conquered various areas of knowledge is explained by Bronowski in his book The Ascent of Man. Such explanations based on scientific postulates may not be tolerated by religion, that rely on mythology and revelations for the explanations of the riddles of the world. Therefore there are clashes between science and religion. Sciences rob the religions of their miracles and mysticism on which the religions stand. Religion is a fantasy of mind. It cannot face the scientific methods. Religious fantasies are the results of wishful thinking and sciences do not allow wishes to play but they lead to the facts. Russell says, "our wishes produce almost irresistible tendency to believe. Scientific methods sweep aside our wishes and endeavours to arrive at opinions in which wishes play no part." Wishes tend to believe because beliefs give the feeling of security. It is escapism. The fight between science and religion is a fight between the tendency to escape and tendency to face with courage, between craving for psychological security and being vulnerable. Such a conflict does not exist between science and religion, as conceived by Krishnamurti. This is because Krishnamurti's religion is not escapism, fantasy or superstitions. It does not contradict the facts arrived at by discoveries of sciences. Religion according to Krishnamurti is not escape from what is, it is not seeking security in projections of
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mind, it is living with facts as they are. In this sense Krishnamurti's religion is compatible, not only with science but also with the scientific attitude.

Scientific attitude is a universal attitude. Krishnamurti's religious mind has scientific attitudes. It does not accept supernatural concepts as god or soul, which superstitions and unscientific.

The atheists, the materialists and the agnostics deny the traditional religions on the ground that they are irrational and they substitute for religion some non-religious ideologies such as Humanism, Communism, Secularism. Krishnamurti denies not only religion but also all other ideologies because they are all products of thought. He holds that all the ideologies substituted for religion are as invalid and fictitious as religion. Krishnamurti's unique contribution, to the solution of human problems lies in his pointing out the two-fold function of thought. Thought at the level of technology has helped humanity to achieve physical comforts. This thought, when it enters the plane of religion, morality, aesthetics, creates problems. It is not its field, it does not recognise its limitations, and with power of ideation, interferes the domain of insight and intelligence. A.D. Dhopeshwarker points out how thought feels itself the master of life. "Having thus subordinated facts to its own contrivances thought stream feels acts as if it is
the supreme power in the world; it has only to sharpen its own tools, and the world could be moulded to its own ends or ideals. Not only does it feel self sufficient, in the sense that it was within itself all the germs of self correction that it needs, but it feels itself the complete master of life, so that it can solve all the problems we may encounter and ensure full and happy life for all of us.\(^1\)

Thought cannot transcend itself and it enters the field of religion, virtue, beauty. Thought wants to take responsibilities to guide in this field thought cannot because thought is mechanical and beauty, virtue, love are not mechanical, they cannot be practised under the guidance of thought. Thought cannot guide love, virtue, beauty but it must be guided by them; only then can the humanity be saved. They should use thought but they should not be used by thought, when thought uses love, love ceases to be. Thought cannot reach that area.

Like Krishnamurti there are many philosophers who have realised the limitations of thought. Thus Intuitionists have held that God beauty, virtue cannot be known by thought but can be known by a higher faculty called Intuition. Kant and other agnostics have insisted on the limitations of thought or reason to apprehend reality of god, soul etc. But Kant accepted God, soul and immortality as demands of practical reason, on faith as postulates of morality. Similarly

---
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Wittgenstein in his later phase and ordinary language philosophers have propounded fideism. Mysticism also insists on the limitations of thought and claims that God, soul and other supernatural objects can be directly apprehended in mystical experience. The logical positivists deny religious language to be cognitively meaningful, but they assert it to have emotive significance.

Thus Intuitionism, mysticism, fideism and emotivism reject the intellectualist or the rationalist conception of religion for different reasons. They all hold that thought or reason is incapable of giving us knowledge of God, soul or religious truths and to this extend Krishnamurti seems to be in agreement with these anti-intellectualist trends. But he does not agree with the intuitionist or the mystic that God or Soul or such transcendent spiritual entities can be known by a different and probably a higher faculty called intuition or mystical experience. Against those who maintain that we can know the truth or God intuitively, he says, "One must be very careful of that word 'intuition'; in that word lies great deception, because one can have intuition dictated by one's hopes, fears, bitterness, wishes and so on." 1 Thus Krishnamurti denies the validity of intuition and regards it as a projection of thought, as a delusion.

His observation about mystical experience is not much different from his observation about intuition. Most of us are bored with the usual experience of every day. We are

1. J. Krishnamurti, The Impossible Question, p.43
tired of them all. Because we find our routine life dull, we demand wider, deeper and more significant experiences and we try various means like yoga, etc. to obtain such spiritual experiences. The demand for more and more experiences shows the inward poverty of man. The desire for satisfaction and the nature of one's conditioning dictate the experience. Please is the standard by which we measure these experiences. But these experiences are not valid, Krishnamurti says, "You can have marvellous experiences and yet be completely deluded. You will inevitably see visions according to your conditioning; you will see Christ or Buddha or whoever you happen to believe in and the greater a believer you are the stronger will be your visions, the projections of your own demands and urges."¹

Krishnamurti points out that there is nothing new in such experiences. It is dictated by one's desires, urges, heavy conditioning and so on. The very fact that one can recognise an experience shows that it is not a new experience. The demand for more is satisfied either in dreams or in such illusions. Thus our visions are no more trustworthy than our dreams. These experiences can be accounted for in the same way as we account for dreams. They are the result of self-hypnosis. Krishnamurti, therefore, concludes, "So we have discovered a fundamental truth, which is that a mind that is seeking, craving for wider and deeper experience is a very shallow and dull mind because it lives always with its memories."²

¹ J. Krishnamurti, Freedom from the Known, p1112
² Ibid., p.113
Agnosticism and fideism recognize that theoretical knowledge of God or other spiritual objects is not possible. The existence of God, soul, or any such supernatural or transcendent entity cannot be known or proved by theoretical reason or by any other cognitive faculty like intuition or mystical experience. Kant, for instance holds that from the point of view of pure or theoretical reason God, soul etc are unknowable. But he does not deny the existence of God nor does he deny the meaningfulness of the concept of God. Instead of denying the validity of religious beliefs on the ground that thought cannot know or prove them, he makes room for faith by pointing out the limitations of pure or theoretical reason. "We can neither affirm nor deny the existence of God because God is beyond the reach of speculative reason; but for Kant what is beyond the reach of speculative reason is not thereby beyond the reach of all reason and so meaningless." There is another kind of employment of reason, namely, practical reason. And when we analyse what is implied in man's moral willing of the highest good, we find that without the postulates of God, Freedom and immortality our moral faith about the ultimate attainability of moral perfection and the coincidence of happiness and virtue becomes unjustified. Whatever is not contrary to pure reason but is necessary for practical reason must be accepted. God, freedom and immortality are such ideas. Kant thus comes to accept these religious beliefs.

1. M.J. Charlesworth, Philosophy of Religion: The Historic Approaches, p.110
Kant's position is open to many objections. But from Krishnamurti's point of view, practical reason or will is a part of thought. Moreover the demand that virtues mean should be happy is a desire for future happiness and he gets security from the belief in God as the moral governor. Thus this belief in God is the projection of thought which is seeking happiness and security and hence it has no validity.

The logical positivists do not merely assert like Kant that God is beyond the reach of pure or theoretical reason. They hold that any talk of a transcendent object being, in principle, unverifiable does not make sense. That is to say there is no way, no criterion to decide truth or falsity of any assertion concerning transcendent objects. May therefore hold that all religious utterances are cognitively meaningless. Religious expressions like ethical and aesthetic judgements are purely emotive or are expressions of attitudes but they do not assert the existence or non-existence of any object; they do not express propositions. Thus for the logical positivists and linguistic philosophers the problem as to how we can know God or other supernatural entities or religious truths does not arise. Religion is a matter of feeling or emotions.

For Krishnamurti the question whether religion is a matter of thought or feeling, will or emotion is not a genuine question because it presupposes that thought, will and feeling are separate movements and this division or separation
is the product of thought. Thought divides mind into cognition, emotion and conation. But is this division valid? If we try to understand and solve a problem of life through thought only in isolation from emotion and will, then that intellectual understanding does not lead to action and the problem of idea and action, theory and practice arises. For instance if you see the danger of conditioning as an intellectual concept or see that rationalism leads to self-destruction through an intellectual process of analysis but if there is no emotional content in that then you will never do anything about it. "Only when there is an emotional content do you become vital."1 He says, "We try to find an answer intellectually or emotionally as though the intellect were something separate from emotion and emotion something separate from the physical response. Our education and culture together with all our philosophical concepts are based on this intellectual approach to life, our social structure and our morality are based on this division."2

This does not mean that we do not or should not for certain purposes distinguish between thought and emotion. Thus when we think of a mathematical or a scientific problem it is predominantly an intellectual process and kindness, anger, hate are predominantly feelings or emotions, which make the heart throb and beat slower or faster. But to treat the movement of the brain and the movement of the heart as two separate movements is arbitrary and artificial. As thought

1. J. Krishnamurti, Freedom from the known, p.28
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has divided the individual into soul, mind and body but it is really a psychosomatic organism, so also thought had divided the movement of the brain from the movement of the heart, though it is really one unitary process. The religious mind responds totally. "It is the response of the nerves; the heart, the brain, the whole organism, the psychosomatic organism." ¹ Krishnamurti says, "In seeing a danger as a mere idea there is conflict between the idea and action and that conflict takes away your energy. It is only when you see the conditioning and the danger of it immediately and as you would see a precipice, that you act. So seeing is acting." ² Therefore to treat religion as a matter of intellect or feeling or will is false and in the fields of morality, aesthetics and religion the partitions are down between cognition, conation and affection.

Thus we see that Krishnamurti rejects the traditional religions with their gods and scriptures, the social, political, and other non-religious ideas and ideologies as projections of thought. Thought creates the 'me', the self and seeks psychological security of the 'me'. It seeks psychological security because it feels inwardly poor, empty, insecure. It feels void, and tries to fill this bottomless pit with knowledge, with ideologies and so on and feels safe in these projections. But when one starts seriously questioning whether there is real security in these ideas and ideologies, one finds that there is no such security in anything. The

¹ J. Krishnamurti, Tradition and Revolution p.191
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thinker then finds that he cannot cling to anything for support, for security. This realization may lead a person to despair and may lead him to embrace existentialism. The existentialist who realizes nothingness through the feeling of anxiety finds that life has no meaning, no significance. All our attempts to give it significance through identification of ourselves with grant and noble ideas and ideals are delusions. They are the outward masks but inside the mask we are ugly empty, nothing. The existentialist sees the absurdity of the whole life, of the whole existence. Thus the existentialist sees the futility of all escapes and when he refuses to escape from this void, from this nothingness, he lives an authentic life. This authentic life is the life of boredom, despair, nothingness, absurdity, anxiety dread. This is the final conclusion that the existentialist draws from his observation.

Now Krishnamurti does not stop at this stage. He asks, both those who indulge in various activities in order to escape from this void and those who refuse to escape from this void to find out inwardly psychologically, why we are in this state of utter boredom. We either accept or reject boredom. But if we don't accept or reject it but are simply aware of it, observe it without any movement of thought, without the 'me', the self then we find that there is no despair because despair like hope is a part of thought.

When thought realises that whatever movement it makes it

\[1\] J. Krishnamurti, *The First and Last Freedom*, p. 191
is still within the field of time, whether it calls it despair, fulfilment, pleasures, fear... When thought realizes all this is a movement of itself in different forms, it stops.¹ When thought seeks psychological security and does not find it then it is in despair. But when there is no movement of thought, when thought becomes absolutely quiet, and not only thought which is a part of the brain but the total brain becomes silent, there is something entirely different. There is complete mutation, total revolution in the human psyche. There is a totally different type of movement which is not the movement of thought, time in which there is no centre. Krishnamurti says, "Now, there is passion only when sorrow has no movement... Sorrow is energy... when there is no movement at all in sorrow, there is an explosion into passion."² Krishnamurti calls this state Intelligence, love compassion. This is the highly religious state. But Krishnamurti refuses to call it God. He says, "I refuse to use the word "God" but this state is not an invention. It is not a thing put together by cunning thought is completely without movement. That is why it is important to explore thought and not the 'other.'"³

To recapitulate, we have seen that Krishnamurti rejects the traditional religious beliefs and practices completely but does not substitute another set of beliefs or ideas in their place. He rejects thought as fragmentary limited and conditioned but he neither substitutes for it any higher cognitive faculty like intuition or mystical experience.

¹ J. Krishnamurti, Tradition and Revolution, p.141-42
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³ J. Krishnamurti, Tradition and Revolution p.147
nor does he make religion a matter of emotions, sentimentality or volition. He agrees with the existentialists that all ideologies—social political, economic, religious, ethical are projections of thought in order to escape from the void and therefore they have no validity whatsoever but he does not stop with despair and boredom. He says that there is a different type of explosion, different type of movement and that is intelligence, love, compassion, virtue, beauty and so on. But he warns his listeners and readers not to accept that state on his authority and also not to be satisfied with the descriptions he gives of that state. Since that state transcends thought, transcends language, it cannot be described. Krishnamurti, therefore says, "Religion then is something that cannot possibly be put into words; it cannot be measured by thought." According to him the investigation into what is sacred is really an exploration of thought, its structure, its movements. To find out that which is immeasurable, thought as measure must come to an end. To come to the timeless, thought as time must come to an end. And thought comes to an end not through efforts, not through time but through understanding, perception which is not of time. Thus we can say that for Krishnamurti criticism becomes all important.

Krishnamurti's approach to religion is negative. In negative, the positive is born. What is important is to see the falseness of all religions, to be aware of the total

confusion and not to attempt to understand 'the other'
which is beyond thought and time. He says, "You cannot
think about something that you do not know...Our problem
is not how to seek the unknowable, but to understand the
accumulative processes of mind which is ever the known."¹
The mind which is in confusion, which does not know what
truth, love and compassion are must say "I don't know."
i.e., it must have humility; it must have passion to find out
what love, compassion and truth are and therefore must not
be satisfied with any description of truth, love and
compassion. However convincing, however logical and consoling
the description is, it is a description and not a fact. He
says, "So we can see that a confused mind, a mind ridden with
sorrow, a mind that is aware of its own emptiness, loneliness,
can never find that which is beyond itself. That which is
beyond the mind can only come into being when the causes
of confusion, misery are dispelled and understood. All that
I have been saying, talking about is how to understand ourselves
for without self-knowledge, the other is not, the other is only
an illusion."² Thus his positive views, his description of
the unconditioned mind has no reality for us. They are
just words. One should not give much importance to these
words, to this description. If we accept that description
it would be an idea, it would be an escape from 'what is'.
It would obstruct our understanding of ourselves because
then we would cease to learn. Therefore to understand religion

¹. J. Krishnamurti, The First and Last Freedom, p. 256-57
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is to explore into what religions are. "Through the negation of 'what is' in the so-called religions, you come to the positive."¹ There is no linear passage from the known to the unknown, from the conditioned to the unconditioned. There is no method, no system for going from the known to the unknown. The perception, understanding of the known, of the conditioned opens the door to the unknown, the unconditioned. But to have this understanding of the known, of 'what is' is an arduous task. But if one perceives it then "the very perception of it, that is, the seeing is the acting and ending. Seeing that this movement is time, is measure, seeing the whole map of it, the nature of it, the structure of it, that very perception acts in ending it. So the seeing is the ending. There is no effort involved in it all."²

Krishnamurti's conception of Philosophy of religion also differs from the traditional conceptions of philosophy of religion. He says, "Philosophy means the love of truth, not love of words, not love of ideas, not love of speculation, but the love of truth. And that means you have to find out for yourself where reality is and that reality cannot become truth. You cannot go through reality to come to truth."³ And we have seen that for him religion means "to gather together all energy, which will then be capable of investigating if there is truth which is not controlled, shaped or polluted by thought."⁴ Thus for him the function of philosophy is

¹ J. Krishnamurti, Beyond Violence, p.49
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negative, to show the futility of all religions which are the product of thought.
It does not have a positive or justificatory function of describing religious experience or justifying certain beliefs.

The following seem to be the important features of Krishnamurti's concept of religion:

1) It is a religion without any theology, without any beliefs, rituals and practices;
2) It is consistent with the scientific attitude as the mind is not required to accept anything that science does not accept.
3) It is not dogmatic, obscurantist or conservative. It is a religion of a sceptic, materialist and even a positivist. It is acceptable to a rebellious mind. It is revolutionary. Religion is 'total revolution'.
4) Religion is self-knowledge; constant learning without arriving at conclusions. Scholarship, expertise are irrelevant.
5) There is no passage from the known to the unknown. Choiceless awareness of 'what is', Attention, watchfulness, care, diligence are the marks of religious mind.
6) Religious mind comes into being with the emergence of Intelligence, love, compassion, beauty, virtue, freedom, peace. Then there is complete clarity, no conflict.
7) The aim of religion is not personal salvation, but 'to be completely at peace within ourselves and in all our relationships with others.'

---

1. J. Krishnamurti, Freedom from the Known, p.59
8) The religion is holistic, the individual is a psychosomatic organism.

9) There is no seeking, no striving, living in the eternal present.

The following are the important features of his conception of philosophy of religion:

1) It separates the field of science and technology from the field of religion morality and beauty. The former is the field of thought, knowledge and memory; these concepts have no relevance in the latter field.

2) His philosophy is free from any standpoint and commitment. In this sense it is free to investigate facts as they are.

3) In its criticism, it does not leave scope to build another philosophy, as its approach is negative. Absolute destruction is itself a philosophy.

4) There is no linear passage from known to unknown. In the freedom from the known, the unknown is.

5) It is not speculative nor analytic but it is holistic

Krishnamurti talks and discusses about the vital problems of human life and we have so far tried to give a faithful exposition of this views and to fix his place in the fields of religion and philosophy of religion. Our aim here is limited to verbal or intellectual understanding of his teaching. Persons who have been listening to him for years are
quite often doubtful whether they have really understood Krishnamurti; whether what he says is true, whether his teachings are practical i.e. whether they are meant for an ordinary intelligent man and how can they be brought into practice; whether he really says anything new or whether what he says is the old teaching in a new language. Whether Krishnamurti who denies guru, authority can be looked at as a guru and an authority and so on. These questions seem to be important and therefore it is essential to consider some of these questions if we claim to have gained a critical understanding of Krishnamurti's teachings.

(a) Communication gap.

It is extremely difficult to communicate with one another even if we know each other very well and the problems we discuss are mundane problems of our ordinary life. This is because the language which is the chief instrument of communication has its limitations, its defects and we always try to understand everything from our past knowledge, conditioning and we may have certain prejudices, certain attitudes. The speaker uses a word with one meaning and the hearer interprets or understands it differently. Thus there is very often a communication gap between the speaker and the hearer, the writer and the reader. Therefore for an effective communication it is essential that one listens without any prejudice, without any conditioning, with seriousness and
attention and not casually with sympathy and not with resistance, with the motive of understanding and not with a motive of finding fault with the speakers.

The problem of listening or understanding or communicating becomes more complex when we move from the filed of science and technology to the filed of morality and religion. In the former field we communicate thoughts or ideas and the understanding is verbal or intellectual. It is a matter of imparting information or teaching skills and the learner intellectually grasps it, commits it to memory, accepts or rejects it, practices it and thus acquires knowledge or skill. But morality and religion are not matters of scholarship or expertise. The notions of acquiring knowledge or skill are totally irrelevant to it. If one wants to learn morality one cannot learn it by reading books, or listening to learned talks. So also one cannot be religious by acquiring scholarships or technical skill. The communication between a teacher and a learner, therefore, in the field of morality and religion is of a qualitatively different type. In this field teaching does not mean imparting information or training a person in acquiring skill, and learning does not mean receiving information or acquiring skill in the sense of habit-forming. The problem of communication becomes extremely difficult when the speaker claims to have a mystical or transcendent experience of reality or god and which he wants to communicate to the persons who lack that experience.
When we come to consider whether we have understood, Krishnamurti the communication gap becomes too wide to be bridged. He claims to talk from silence from the state of unconditioned mind, from the perception of truth and the listeners or readers try to understand it through their conditioned thought. Krishnamurti expresses the difficulty of his listeners very clearly. He says, "You see, what you say has no system, no method, because they are all part of the conditioning. You say, something totally new, unexpected to which I haven't even given a single moment of thought. You come along with a basket full and I do not know how to receive you. This has been really a problem, to the prophets."

Though the traditional mystics and prophets have felt this problem of communication, they have tried to overcome it either by using the official religious terminology i.e. by using the words which have been in use in the traditional religions such as the words God, soul, immortality and secondly they have used our usual words analogically. They have tried to simplify their visions by the use of myths and allegories. Krishnamurti adopts neither of these ways to reduce the communication gap. This is probably because he feels that if he makes use of the traditional religious concepts, the the listeners are likely to understand them with their traditional associations. This, instead of reducing the communications gap, actually increases it but it also creates an illusion that we have understood what the speaker

1. J. Krishnamurti, Truth and Actuality, p. 36
says. Moreover, the use of familiar religious concepts is likely to make the minds of the listeners lazy; their minds would not be as alert as they are when they listen to an unfamiliar concept or word. Krishnamurti also does not use allegorical, metaphorical language but as far as possible uses words in their literal sense. Thus not only his vision, but also the content of what he says is totally new, but he also refuses to communicate his vision through the traditional religious terminology and through the use of allegories and metaphors. Furthermore, he wants his listeners to understand what he says not only verbally, intellectually, logically but also actually. He says, "We come to a certain point and we say: "Yes, I see and I recognise logically, that in those things there is no security and when they are questioned there is fear. And when we say we see that, what do we mean by the word 'see'? Is it merely a logical understanding, a verbal understanding, a linear understanding, or is it an understanding which is so profound that very understanding breaks down without any effort, the whole movement of thought? When you say: 'I understand what you are saying', what do you mean by that word 'understand'? Do you mean you understand the English words? Is it an understanding of the words, the meaning of the words, the explanation of the words and therefore an understanding only at a very superficial level? Or, is it that, when you say 'I understand', you mean you actually 'see', or observe the truth as to what thought is; you actually feel, taste, observe in your blood as it were, that
thought, whatever it creates, has no security? You 'see' the truth of it and therefore you are free of it. 1

Now Krishnamurti wants his listeners, his readers, to 'see the truth actually. He asks them to 'look', to listen, to 'observe' but the listeners just cannot 'see', 'listen' in that way. They are incapable of 'observing' in that sense. Therefore Krishnamurti's words are just words to them. He puts forward this difficulty of his listeners by saying, "You say, 'Please see that'. And I can't see it because I am always living in the realm of reality. You are living in the realm of truth and I can't. There is no relationship between you and me. I accept your word, I see the reason of it, I see the logic of it, I see the actuality of it, but I can't break it down.

How will you help - I am using that word hesitantly how can you help me to break this down? It's your job, because you see the truth and I don't. You say 'For God's sake, see this'. How will you help me? Through words? Then we enter into the realm with which I am quite familiar. This is actually going on. So what is one to do? ....... How will you convey this to me? I want to find out, I'm very keen? I want to get out of this." 2

There is only one way of understanding each other actually and that is that the speaker and the listener must be at the same level, with the same intensity, with the same passion. 3 But if this happens with the listeners of Krishnamurti, they won't go to him for finding out solutions

1. J. Krishnamurti, The Wholeness of Life, p.161
2. J. Krishnamurti, Truth and Actuality, p.35
3. J. Krishnamurti, Awakening of Intelligence, p.383
and if this does not happen, then they would understand him at the most only verbally intellectually and therefore would actually remain in the same state of confusion and conflict.

b) The gap between idea and action.

Most of the listeners and readers of Krishnamurti are able to understand his teaching only intellectually. Therefore there arises a gap between the verbal understanding of his teaching and actually living a life of intelligence, love and peace. There is a gap between an idea and action. Naturally the listeners are prone to ask: How can we be unconditioned? How can we have the same intensity, the same passion as Krishnamurti has? How can we attain that state where there is no conflict? In other words, how can we translate the idea into action or actual practice?

Krishnamurti's answer to this is that the question has to find out, to be aware of this question and what is implied in asking this question. The question implies that the questioner has accepted the unconditioned state, the state of intelligence on the authority of Krishnamurti and has made it an ideal to be attained. Secondly, he thinks that he would attain that state in future after following certain method, certain system. Thus he accepts time. Thirdly he also accepts that there is the 'self' who wants to achieve this state. Thus the questioner has come to accept the 'self', seeking to be free from thought, he accepts authority
method, time an idea of the unconditioned state, efforts and the whole structure of thought. But to accept Krishnamurti's teaching even verbally or intellectually is to reject the whole structure of thought; is to see that thought cannot lead us to truth, to actuality. The problem, therefore is not 'how' to be unconditioned but to be aware of the fact that the question arises because of my lack of sensitivity and to be aware of one's insensitivity. We then realise that there is no way of translating the idea into action; that ideas cannot produce action in the fundamental sense, they only produce reaction which are the products of thought, memory and conditioning. Once the questioner sees this actually in that very perception there is an ending of thought therefore ending of the duality between idea and action, therefore ending of conflict. But the questioner raised this question precisely because he could not actually see it. Thus we would be moving in a vicious circle that there won't be perception unless thought comes to an end and thought won't come to an end unless there is perception. Actually these are not two separate things and there is no method of ending thought or of having perception. What one has to do is to be intensely aware of this whole conflict.

c) **Is Krishnamurti's teaching true?**

We have seen that most of the persons who listen to and read Krishnamurti from the practical spiritual motive are able
to understand his teaching only verbally or intellectually. But there may be other persons who try to understand his teaching academically or intellectually. They approach his teaching from the theoretical point of view. For such persons the question naturally arises whether his teaching is true or how to test the validity of Krishnamurti's teaching. Fortunately Krishnamurti himself has discussed this question. He asks how can one know that what Krishnamurti says is true. "He might be caught on his own conditioning illusions and knowing them, and not being able to free himself from them, have put together a series of observations, words and call them truth. How do you know whether what he is saying is actual, truthful and lasting?"1

This problem arises in connection with all religious and metaphysical doctrines. But since Krishnamurti does not propound any theories, any philosophical systems, this problem takes a different shape. Krishnamurti considers two possibilities. He says, "There are two things involved. The speaker is either talking out of the silence of truth, or he is talking out of the noise of an illusion which he considers to be the truth."2 He claims that he is talking from direct perception of truth. But how shall we know whether what he considers to be the direct perception of truth is not an illusion and that he is not deceiving himself and also others?

One of the criteria that can be applied for determining the truth of a statement made by a person on the basis of personal experience is whether the man is trustworthy, whether he has intellectual and moral integrity. Applying 1. J. Krishnamurti, The Wholeness of Life, p.233
this criterion, majority of persons who know him, who have read or listened to him would agree that Krishnamurti has integrity. Thus Leonard Sainville, a communist, says, "I can assure that while Krishnamurti did not convert me, nor could he undermine the rational foundations on which I base my Marxism analysis of human behaviour, personal and social yet, I must appreciate his transparent honesty and intellectual integrity." 1

Another criterion for testing the truth of a statement is to verify it in one's own experience. But as we have observed, majority of his listeners and readers have been able only to understand him intellectually and none has said that he has verified the truth of Krishnamurti's teaching by his own experience.

Krishnamurti himself raises an interesting question; "who is going to judge, who is going to see the truth of the matter? The listener, the reader? You who know Indian scriptures, Buddhism, the Upanishads etc. Are you capable of judging? How will you find out? How will you approach this problem?" 2 Thus he points out that a person who is conditioned by tradition cannot be a judge because he can only compare Krishnamurti's teaching with the tradition which he accepts. He also suggests that the personality of the speaker what we know about his life also must be put aside, otherwise our judgement is likely to be vitiated by these considerations. Thus if one puts aside what one knows about the speaker,
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what one knows by reading books, then alone one would be able to listen to the speaker. He says, "I'll tell you what I would do. I would keep his personality, his influence, all that completely aside. Because I don't want to be influenced. I am sceptical, doubtful, so I am very careful. I listen to him and I don't say, 'I know or I don't know'. ... I want to find out." When I put away what I know about the speaker when I put away all the knowledge I acquired through books, through experience, and therefore not comparing, judging, evaluating, and am passionately interested to find out "then I proceed. I want to know but I am not going to be easily persuaded, pulled into something by argument cleverness, logic. Now, I am capable of listening to what he is saying with complete abandonment of the past. It comes to that. Then my relationship to him is entirely different. Then I am listening out of silence."

In that silence there is learning, constant learning. One does not arrive at a conclusion. "When one has an insight, a direct perception into what is being said, then there is no doubt that it is the truth. Having that insight you can work it out logically to show that the perception is true." That perception is action. But if one makes that action into a formula and stops having the insight then it brings confusion. So if one does not arrive at a conclusion, one does not make formula of his insight or action, then there is only learning. There is no time, no memory, no knowledge, no conflict, no thought from that silence is the truth.
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