Krishnamurti comprehends Life as a process of consciousness focused in the individual. The manifest universe in which the individual is involved, is therefore a projection of his own consciousness. The fundamental structure of the consciousness of all individuals is based on the same principle. In order to understand the significance of one's involvement in the world of one's creation, one must try to understand the principle involved in the structure of one's consciousness. According to Krishnamurti, it is only then that man can be free from limitations, and transcend the illusion of duality in consciousness. That is why Krishnamurti considers self knowledge to be the beginning of wisdom: "In understanding myself, I shall understand my relationship with another, with the world, for in me, as in each one, is the whole".

It is evident from the above that in the individual is contained the collective, the society, the whole. Therefore according to Krishnamurti to understand life and the significance of existence is to understand oneself as
related to and involved in others, which is society, which is the whole. Self-knowledge is important therefore to establish right relationship, to establish order in society and to have peace in the world. Self knowledge forms the basis of true social order, since it not only implies the action of relationship between two individuals but also the action in relationship in society. Krishnamurti considers self knowledge as the only way in which the individual and society can observe, and can be choicelessly aware of the responses of the mind to the challenges of life without evaluating them, without comparing, judging, condemning or justifying. In this way it is possible to transcend the illusion of duality which breeds contradictions and inconsistencies. It can be concluded that for Krishnamurti, self-knowledge is not just an intellectual discipline but a way of life.

Since Krishnamurti implies that life is action and action is relationship, for him the individual and society are not separate - they form a unitary process. It is, first and foremost, the individual who in his relationship with others, forms what is called society. And the function of society is to help the individual fulfil himself.

R.K. Shringy significantly analysed this relationship between the individual and society when he wrote: "since
the present civilization is the manifestation of action based on idea, action that is self centred and self motivated, the individual identified as he is with the conditions of his being, finds himself in conflict with society; and the society composed as it is of individuals that are ever in competition with each other and are consumed with the desire for power and domination at one level or the other, is ever trying to force the individual to fit into the mould of the group and to reduce him to be a cog in the machine. The conflict between individual and society is the result of the lack of understanding with regard to the true significance of life as an indivisible whole.

The crux of the situation in the social field is the relative importance of the individual and society, whether the society is for the individual or the individual is for the society. For Krishnamurti, life is relationship, and, hence there can be no antagonism between society and individual. What Krishnamurti means by individual is the man who is free from fear and is able to conduct himself intelligently by understanding the laws of life, and, who does not need any institution to make him moral. Krishnamurti looks at the chaos in society as the cumulative result of the individual in contradiction. This reflects in his relationship to other individuals and to
Hence Krishnamurti states that the problem of existence is rooted in consciousness (fragmentation of consciousness) and can only be solved through the ‘radical transformation of the psyche' by abolishing the self as the centre of conditioning. Krishnamurti firmly believes that all human problems can be eliminated if our life and action can surface above the limitations of class, creed, national and religious consciousness that divide the world. Hence in very simple terms, ‘fragmentation of consciousness', which Krishnamurti speaks of, is a process that has been cultivated by societies through the ages and has culminated to a point where each one is for himself and is therefore in conflict with the other. Self knowledge is the solution that Krishnamurti offers in one's perception of the true. Krishnamurti assigns the field of thought (understanding the significance of life) to individual action; and the field of physical existence (in organizing the necessities of existence) for collective action. As he notes: "That is in the field of thinking and feeling you must not set up another as a guide, but be integrally alone, whereas in work you must plan together, collectively for a living. Therein lies the remedy. It is by the expression of individuality in its rightful place that you can find freedom which is truth; and in the realisation of the truth
you will solve your social and economic problems".

Fragmentation of consciousness has arisen as a result of identification with idea. According to Krishnamurti the individual must stop the process of identification. This is what he terms as \textit{mutation of mind}. It is only the voluntary perception of the truth about 'what is' that can bring about this mutation of mind. No extent of persuasion, or influence through hope or fear or through compulsion can bring about this mutation of mind. Hence to Krishnamurti, no organisation and no method is required for bringing about this change and hence no authority, either of tradition or of a guru is necessary. In fact it is this particular approach that has aroused misunderstanding among those who are not acquainted with Krishnamurti's language. Some of the misunderstandings arise mainly out of misconceptions. It must be understood that Krishnamurti is not against learning from books, or tradition, or gurus or systems of thought. He only cautions against reliance on any of these as an authority. According to Krishnamurti, subservience to authority in any form breeds conformity and delays the 'awakening of intelligence', as Krishnamurti states: "action based on reward and punishment, influence or pressure inevitably brings about conflict".

Krishnamurti is against any form of stimulation, pressure
or influence since these are only external factors and do not help one to actually learn about oneself. As he points out: "when you study and learn about yourself, there comes an extraordinary strength based on clarity, which can withstand all the nonsense of the establishment. This strength is not a form of resistance or self-centred obstinacy, or, will, but is a diligent observation of the outer and the inner".

Krishnamurti places self-knowledge at the centre of his teachings. It may appear that he gives too much importance and emphasis to the individual and that he has a lack of concern for society. Krishnamurti sees the individual as being significantly responsible for bringing about a radical social transformation. According to Krishnamurti: "the older the civilization, the greater the weight of tradition with its series of imitations; and being burdened with this weight your mind is never free". Thus the whole of life is hedged in with the limitations of certain ideas. According to Krishnamurti, books, teachers, parents, the society, "tell us what to think, but they never help us to find out how to think. To know what to think is comparatively easy, because from early childhood our minds are conditioned by words, by phrases, by established attitudes and prejudices".
Krishnamurti cautions against an educational system that is directed towards the acquisition of knowledge since it only leads to a mechanistic way of life with the mind functioning along narrow grooves leading to "a mental standardisation, and so, gradually, the state, even a democratic state, dictates what we should become". The result is that freedom is endangered. What Krishnamurti refers to is not freedom which deals with opinion or prejudice but, as Krishnamurti says, with a:"non verbal understanding of the implications and consequences of the mind. This flowering is the total unfoldment and cultivation of our minds, our hearts and our physical well being. That is to live in complete harmony in which there is no opposition or contradiction between them. The flowering of the mind can take place only when there is clear perception, objective, non personal, unburdened by any kind of imposition upon it. It is not what to think but how to think clearly".

Krishnamurti forcefully points out the importance of developing the mind, "a mind which is capable of dealing with the many issues of life as a whole, and which does not try to escape from them and so become self-contradictory, frustrated, bitter or cynical". Since the development of the mind is the chief concern, how one teaches is very significant to the whole process of teaching and learning.
in schools. Hence Krishnamurti points out that "there must be a cultivation of the totality of the mind, and not merely the giving of information. In the process of imparting knowledge, the educator has to invite discussion and encourage the students to inquire and to think independently".

Krishnamurti speaks of a concerted effort between individuals and society to bring about the right kind of education: "the kind of education that will produce a new generation capable of dealing with the issues of life as a whole and not as isolated parts unrelated to the whole".

Krishnamurti founded schools in India viz at Rishi Valley (in Andhra Pradesh) and Rajghat (at Benares); and Brockwood Park in England, the Oak Grove School at Ojai, California and the Wolf Lake School in Canada. The objective of these schools is in Krishnamurti's own words: "not only to be excellent, academically but much more. They are to be concerned with the cultivation of the total human being. These centres of education must help the student and the educator to flower naturally". Krishnamurti's main objective in the schools that he started is to: "bring about intelligence, if that is possible. The word 'intelligence' means having the faculty of understanding - to understand not only each other, but also what
cooperation means, what freedom, what discipline and order mean".

So education is to create an intelligence which is not mere instinct or desire, but an intelligence that will function in this world. Krishnamurti believes that education is meant to prepare oneself to face the world which is crowded with problem situations which are not only economic, social, environmental, but also problems of relationship, of how to live intelligently and not be smothered, corrupted by society. Krishnamurti asserts here that: "Education becomes of the greatest importance. Education being not merely the acquisition of technical knowledge, but the understanding, with sensivity and intelligence, of the whole problem of living - that is the whole structure of human existence".

Krishnamurti is not dealing with specific problems of life related to specific cultures. He is concerned with the universal human predicament. Most significant is Krishnamurti's rejection of the present social order, in so far as it is viewed as being corrupt, and the attempt to reorient the individual in the new social context which is the result of a radical transformation of the psyche. Krishnamurti is emphatic on this point, namely that the only revolution that can transform society is the
revolution that begins within the individual. Political, economic or social revolutions have only produced appalling tyrannies. Krishnamurti speaks of a revolution which is entirely different and which must take place if the individual is to emerge from the endless series of anxieties, conflicts and frustrations. He says: "This revolution has to begin, not with theory and ideation, which eventually prove worthless, but with a radical transformation in the mind itself. Such transformation can be brought about only through right education and the total development of the human being. It is a revolution that must take place in the whole of the mind and not merely in thought".

Most educators agree that education is more than the accumulation of knowledge and that it includes the moral, spiritual, affective and physical capabilities as well. Few, however see the whole educational process as a radical transformation of the psyche. Although contemporary educational programmes have taken in other aspects of learning, it has nevertheless remained a knowledge accumulation process. Krishnamurti believes that it is only through education that a change in society can be brought about. Tragically enough what is in fact happening in education is the reverse - the disintegration of the individual is bringing about the disintegration of society.
The radical transformation that Krishnamurti talks about involves understanding the nature of conditioning and the relationship of the individual to his environment. According to Krishnamurti, change is, dying to the past. When such change does not take place then education leads to a perpetuation of tradition. Hence the two important points to be considered here are: firstly, the emphasis Krishnamurti places on the cultivation of the 'inner', on the integration of consciousness and psychological change. Secondly Krishnamurti points to the destructively conformist function of modern education. The 'socialisation' in schools is seen as being the transmitters of culture and tradition and is given great emphasis in the curriculum. In return, it dominates the actual learning process and the schools remain inherently conservative institutions helping to perpetuate the status quo. Of course Krishnamurti is not the only one to observe this, and a similar critique is put forward by neo-Marxist sociology. Neo-Marxists point towards a symbiosis between schools and society at large and indicate how dominant social groups maintain their positions through the ideological and cultural reification occurring in the school. They point to the curriculum as being an instrument of ideological hegemony reproducing certain socio-economic patterns. Hence it is apparent how schools reproduce and legitimize the status quo. Another
criticism from the Neo Marxist point is the way in which schools select and organize the curriculum towards the objective of perpetuating a competitive and stratified society. Schools not only process the individual but also the knowledge that he must acquiesce and in this way the individual is conditioned for acceptance and to acquiescing in the existing social order. There is no freedom for seeking alternatives to the values and cultural ethos.

Hence the value neutral and the so called apolitical atmosphere of schools disguises the reproductionist and legitimating functions of schools. Schools according to Krishnamurti condition rather than integrate the individual's consciousness. It is this dependence on schools to learn, which in later life, becomes the need to be fed, clothed and entertained, that Krishnamurti is against. Krishnamurti distinguishes between the feeling of being secure and the feeling of dependency, and says that: "consciously or unconsciously, most educators cultivate the feeling of dependency, and thereby subtly encouraged fear - which the parents also do in their own affectionate or aggressive manner". The dogmatic or authoritarian assertions on the part of the parents or the teachers as to what the child must be and do, is what creates this dependency in the child. According to Krishnamurti, with dependency there is always the shadow of fear, and this fear compels the child to obey, to conform, to accept
without thought the edicts and sanctions of his elders. In this atmosphere of dependency, sensitivity is crushed. The child must feel secure, and the impact of the relationship based on confidence will help towards a natural communication free of fear. Krishnamurti says that "being at ease, feeling secure, the child will do what he likes; but in doing what he likes he will find out what is the right thing to do, and his conduct then will not be due to resistance, or obstinacy, or suppressed feelings... ".

The routine and environment of the School is thus a rehearsal simulating the roles the individual will have to enact in the adult life. The rigorous schedules of learning, the rigid time-tables and the weekly activity programme which is subservient to a preplanned curriculum are radically different from the fundamental processes of learning. The students then begin to view work from a very mechanical perspective. Students' progress assessment conditions them to a false sense of their worth, nurturing ambition and shifting their focus to external rewards. This tendency later leads to the pursuit of material goods and social status.

An unplanned dimension of the curriculum as distinct from the planned or visible aspect which has a strong cognitive bias is termed as the hidden curriculum which includes such
diverse factors as students extra curricular interests, peer group pressures and values, social values, personality traits — in short, the various environmental and psychological factors. In fact such a curriculum positively motivates the students and constitutes part of an exciting and refreshing learning adventure. It is important for the educator to know what each student brings into a learning situation so that learning can become meaningful. It is when the focus shifts from these aspects of a hidden curriculum by a near exclusive emphasis on the planned curriculum which is predominantly knowledge based, that the individualised factors are sacrificed to conformity and standardization. In all this, the individual student and what A.Hook appropriately terms as the psychological dimension of the curriculum is ignored.

Krishnamurti looks at this situation in terms of the conscious and unconscious mind which he refers to in this context as the superficial mind and the hidden mind: "The hidden mind is far more vital than the superficial. Most educators are concerned only with giving information or knowledge to the superficial mind, preparing it to acquire a job and adjust itself to society. So the hidden mind is never touched. All that so called education does is to super impose a layer of knowledge and technique, and a certain capacity to adjust to environment".
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Although the neo-Marxist analysis of the hidden curriculum is more complete than most other theories, it however does not look into the psycho-sociological nexus of conditioning. As a result of this the whole mechanism of cultural reproduction cannot be explained. What the neo-Marxist theory asserts is that schools are the grounds on which the dominant interest groups project their ideology and are thus able to retain their supremacy and power. However, they do not explain how this process manipulates and suppresses the individual so effectively and in a very subtle manner. The neo-Marxist view does not take into account the psychological factors involved in this cycle of reproduction, and since they missed the critical aspect of the socialisation process, they cannot see how knowledge then conditions the individual. They cannot see how knowledge per se conditions and fragments consciousness which then serves the interests of the dominant groups by producing an uncreative and indifferent population. As M.W. Apple, for example, argues, that schools accept a 'consensus' view of knowledge and the world rather than a 'conflict' view which he sees necessary for students to create their own knowledge rather than assimilate what is given to them.

Krishnamurti looks at intelligence as "the capacity to deal with life as a whole; and giving grades or marks to the
student does not assure intelligence. On the contrary it degrades human dignity. This comparative evaluation cripples the mind - which does not mean that the teacher must not observe the progress of every student and keep a record of it".

Krishnamurti affirms that any spirit of comparison prevents this full flowering of the individual. He says that "when comparison comes in, then there is the disparagement and the envious reactions which create conflict ..." He further points out that: "giving marks, grading, comparing and any form of computing, either through kindness or through threats, breed fear; and it is because we are caught in this fear while we are young that we struggle in fear for the rest of our life". This has a tremendously stagnant effect on education for as Krishnamurti points out: "Learning implies freedom, curiosity, inquiry. When a child learns something, he is curious about it, he wants to know, it is a free momentum; not a momentum of having acquired and of moving from that acquisition".

Krishnamurti believes that the old order must change giving rise to the new as "the older people, by their attitude towards life, create a form of education which is merely a repetition of the old, so there is no new way of living". Krishnamurti believes that any radical or innovative
changes in education could come only if regenerative ideas were instilled in the young minds. As he succinctly puts it: "That is why it seems to me very important to think about all these matters while you are still very young ... when there is no fear, you study much better. When you feel that you are not being compelled to anything, you will find out what you are interested in and then for the rest of your life you will do something which you really love to do ... if you really love to do something with your hands and with your mind, then through that love you will create a new world. But you cannot create a new world if you are frightened, and therefore while you are young there must be a spirit of revolt". It is with this spirit of adventure that Krishnamurti started his institutional ventures.

Thapan M. examines the relationship between ideology, school and society. She does this by examining a particular case, that of the Rishi Valley school (RVS) which is inspired by the educational philosophy of Krishnamurti. A systematic study follows within an overall sociological framework that takes into account the school as an organization, and also the social world of the students and teachers. The social reality of the school is constructed through the teachers' and students' understanding of the perceptions of the School and what it stands for, a perception of their respective roles and of
one another in the school ambient.

Thapan's observations have significant impact on both Krishnamurti's as well as other contemporary educational ventures. Foremost among these observations is the ease and proficiency with which the educational processes in the school are woven around a well articulated ideology repudiating most conventional and rigid methods of education and yet interestingly participating in a formal school system. Thapan's analysis indicate that the school is grounded in two apparently contradictory orders based on Krishnamurti's educational ideas and the wider educational system. The teacher body is also clearly divided into the 'ideologue' and the pedagogue (i.e. professional teacher).

The student culture is based on school work at the centre of the network of friendship and relationships. The students interest and focus in the school activity is brought to an optimum through excellent teacher-pupil interaction. Thapan identifies the Teacher-pupil interaction as the central process in the school with its characteristic informal approach.

Among the important observations that Thapan makes of the RVS as a socio-cultural-educational venture is the class of ideologies in school processes. Since there are two
different orders namely the transcendental and educational orders, at many points there are dilemmas, contradictions and differences in opinions created by the confrontation between the ideological and the educational dissertations arising from these two different orders. This is seen in all areas of school life and gives rise to the division between teachers in their perceived task vis-a-vis the pupils. Conflicts are also created between the efforts at implementing the ideology by some participants and the pursuit of other interests by other participants, which, may diverge from ideological goals, but are nonetheless a part of school processes.

Thapan has intelligently sifted the value system of a particular mentality of Indian society who patronise RVS and the overall world view of the school. While their background has ingrained in them the competitive spirit and a goal oriented perspective, the ideology of the school emphasizes a different kind of learning, pointing to an alternative world view. This gives rise to a conflict, in the minds of the pupils. This conflict, according to her observation, is also reflected in other areas of school life and in the students views of, and, about the school process. It is obvious that schools do not exist in a vacuum and RVS is no exception. Schools have to function in an interaction with the external environment which often
does not correspond with the school ideology and may result in contrary pressures on school processes. A striking observation made by Thapan is that RVS is dependent on the affluent middle and upper classes for its maintenance as a result of which it has to accommodate and incorporate the values and norms of these classes in its functioning.

It is quite apparent from this that the contradiction between the ideology and the value base is a result of the character of the institutional structure which Krishnamurti has chosen as a basis for implementing his educational ideas. The organisation of Krishnamurti's school is much on the traditional lines of an academic system pitched to need the objectives of an ever demanding social order. This is entirely at odds with the wider goals of Krishnamurti's educational ideology. The students as well as the teachers are in all likelihood in a state of perennial conflict as they have to make inordinate choices in terms of their commitment to the ideology or to the goals of the institutional setting which also includes the academic goals. Some will attempt to make compromises between the two so as to reduce the conflict within themselves.

Since the other public schools have implicit ideologies only tacitly expressed, they do not experience similar
problems as their ideology does not interfere with the institutional structure (of the school) or with the routine school processes. In fact the ideology in these schools is accommodated to suit the structure and functioning of such schools.

The ideology in Krishnanurti's schools is explicitly formulated and is a very characteristic facet of the school image. It is the guiding framework inside which every activity is evaluated. In fact it is the yardstick to assess the immediate means used in the achievement of more long term goals. Thapan recognizes this positive aspect, namely that the ideology permeates school processes to the extent that some teachers or students identify and explain their experience of school life in terms of the ideology and the meaning it has given their lives.

At another level, the culture of the school is made up of the rituals and ceremonies that constitute school life, including the rituals of every day life that are rooted in the academic system, such as tests and examinations. Thapan analyses both the routinized and dramatized rituals in order to verify the configuration of values as well as the organizational and discursive practice that governs the culture of the school. For instance, the relative lack of authoritarian element in the teacher-pupil relationship...
which as was pointed out by Thapan, does present difficulties to the teachers, may be otherwise viewed merely as the outcome of a more general progressive ideology based on a democratic pattern.

Thapan has limited her study to the relations among the students and teachers; relations between the people in the school and school life; between ideas and school activity encompassed by the ideology, the structural and cultural setting of the school and in a broader sense by Society. The study did not go into the implications of such a school and its processes for society. Thapan has only gone as far as pointing out the impact of social influences on school processes and the constraints that these impose on performance. In other words, Thapan has not gone into the core of the matter and attended to the foremost question whether the school and its products can transform society as envisaged by the ideology of Krishnamurti.

The study has also not broached the question of the schools specific value system and the existing social norms and values. Thapan could have given a broader and more meaningful perspective to the study of RVS through a comparative review of other schools (public) with different ideologies. This would give a better understanding at observing how different kinds of ideologies operate through
The apparent difficulties that Thapan faces in assessing the extent to which the ideology is successful in attaining its goals through education is quite evident. In Krishnamurti's ideology the transformation of the psyche of the individual is what is termed as 'change' and the measurement of the extent to which such radical transformation has on the future of society is elusive to a great extent.

Thapan has pointed out that the manner in which such ideological conflicts are resolved is by no means through mutual exclusion or the absorption of one ideology into the other, but perhaps through a genuine dialectic of ideologies which could result in a synthesis.

As also indicated by Thapan, in 'Life at School', a school does not exist in a vacuum, apart from its community. Parental support helps create and sustain the school, particularly its atmosphere. The children bring to the learning situation the moral and social values of the parents. Along with this, they also bring in their expectations of the school, and this influences the whole climate of learning. It is important to involve parents in a healthy network of communication between the teacher,
pupil and parent. Parents have the most influence on the up-bringing of their children and it is important that the responsibility is not shifted entirely to the teacher so that together they can aspire for the fulfillment of the child within the educational set up, and, free from conflicting currents. The cooperation between teachers and parents is important to the progress of any educational effort, and parents can assist the movement of self-knowledge by their own commitment and readiness to investigate their relationship with the child.

Krishnamurti looks apprehensively at a situation where perhaps the greatest difficulty the educator has to face is the indifference of parents to a wider and deeper education. He says: "Most parents are concerned only with the cultivation of some superficial knowledge which will secure their children respectable positions in a corrupt society. So the educator not only has to educate the children in the right way, but also to see to it that the parents do not undo whatever good may have been done at the school. Really the school and the home should be joint centres of right education, and should in no way be opposed to each other, with the parents desiring one thing and the educator doing something entirely different". It is therefore very important that the parents be fully acquainted with what the educator is doing and be vitally
interested in the total development of the child.

The physical environment is an important factor in creating the atmosphere of learning. Krishnamurti suggests situations which are close to nature, open and harmonious where children can develop their sensitivity and freedom. How space is managed in a learning situation is very important to the effectiveness of the teaching and learning effort. In a rigid classroom plan where children are fixed to rows and desks facing the teacher, their relationship with the teacher is immediately locked into one of subservience rather than equality. According to Krishnamurti: "Authority, as the one who knows, has no place in learning. The educator and the student are both learning through their special relationship with each other". But by this very casual attitude it does not mean that the educator disregards the orderliness of thought. As Krishnamurti says: "Orderliness of thought is not brought about by discipline in the form of assertive statements of knowledge; but it comes into being naturally when the educator understands that in cultivating intelligence there must be a sense of freedom". Krishnamurti goes into the detail of explaining the nature of freedom. He says: "It is the freedom in which the student is being helped to be aware of his own urges and motives, which are revealed to him through his daily
thought and action".

If the teacher is to really identify with the students and encourage them to become responsible for their creativity and learning, all the traditional trappings supporting his 'authority and power' will have to be abandoned. In many schools the regimental arrangement of rows of furniture is still maintained and this defines the children not as individuals but as 'members of a class' thereby sustaining the myth of the teachers authority.

It is not apparent how the development of new learning technologies such as computer based learning, individualised learning modules and other vast array of technology have shifted the focus from the traditional status of the teacher – from the dominant role of being the 'source' person to that of a facilitator of learning and guide.

Due to the large class groups, this optimum shift has not been largely utilised in most schools so far. Although it may seem that modern educational technology would depersonalise the learning experience, the contrary is true especially because teachers have more time and energy available for the individual child and the possibility of a whole new dimension such as self-knowledge.
appropriately in the small class unit).

These are the various factors which help create a congenial climate for learning. The essential quality which Krishnamurti calls 'atmosphere', is the **attentiveness** and the alterness of **intelligence** between teacher and pupil. This can only happen when the teacher student relationship is one which is based on mutual trust, honesty and free of fear. Only when the child is psychologically **free** will he begin to learn and this freedom is found in **right relationship** between the teacher and the student.

Krishnamurti advocates the need for an open, less structured or even unstructured education. To help bring about a good society, dogmatic adherence to outmoded aspects of education have to be pushed aside. Krishnamurti points out to the fact that society is what individuals are. Rousseau too believed that society was created by individual and not vice versa. J.J. Rousseau brings out the **essence** of the meaning of social education in *Emile* (Published in 1762) where he emphasizes individual based learning for children by teaching them about nature and shows how the process of learning would take place through discovery. Emile would not require any of the formal teaching required by society. Rousseau wanted Emile to be similar to man in his original, natural self: solitary,
experiencing freedom and strengthening the physical body to prepare the way for the mind. This education would involve practical knowledge. Rousseau and Krishnamurti have many similar views with regard to education. Like Rousseau, Krishnamurti too believed that freedom from the educator's thought processes is the key to ensuring achievement of their natural growth. Many of the ideas of Froebel seem to have permeated the educational ideas of Krishnamurti. Like Froebel, Krishnamurti too believed in the value of childhood not as a transitory phase to adulthood, but a status in itself which possessed its own dimension of creativeness. Froebel believed that the child and adult must establish relationship of pure understanding and mutual respect. Krishnamurti too believed that the educator and the student are both learning, through their special relationship with each other. Froebel advocated the inner relatedness of all education and Krishnamurti states that: "The whole movement of life is learning. There is never a time in which there is no learning. Every action is a movement of learning and every relationship is learning." One cannot but feel a tremendous impact of the meaning of the learning process, and interpret it with what Froebel articulates about the inner relatedness in education and the totality of learning. To Krishnamurti education: "should help you to prepare for life. You may become a clerk, or a Governor or a Scientist, but that is
Again, like Montessori, Krishnamurti believed that education must lead to the complete unfolding of the child's individuality and that self education is the only true education.

Finally, the proclamation of principles, the setting of objectives and curriculums are only extraneous. The heart of the matter is the quality of 'learning' that goes on and which depends largely on the quality of teaching. As Krishnamurti says: "The teacher is helpful only if he is not using teaching to feed his vanity or as a means of his own security. If he is teaching not because he is unable to do anything else, but because he really loves to teach, then he will help the student to grow without fear. This means no examinations, no grading, no marks. If you are to create the right kind of education, you need such teachers to help you to create it". 
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