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(f): J. Krishnamurti's Teaching On Transformation Of Man

--- A Comparative Study!

In answer to the question, 'what is the link between the teachings and transformation?' Krishnamurti makes a direct connection between clarity and transformation. Here it refers to quality of perception which is free from influence. Clarity is not being looked upon as an accomplishment, as an aspect of self-improvement, it is not a static attainment but a continual cleansing of perception. In the same way, transformation should not be viewed as a state which has been reached, arrived or acquired.

No amount of studying the Teachings will transform a greedy mind into a vacant mind. The teachings can't do that for us, despite all the compassion of the Being who brought it about, despite all generosity of Life itself. The teaching can only point out that our house is in a mess and it is for us to clean up the mess, and stay with that, not ask for more. The teachings are one of the most beautiful flowers ever produced by life - one of its most delicious fruits. Can one love the flower and be gratefully fed by the fruit without touching it? Can the greed stop and leave the mind vacant?

J. Krishnamurti has invited our attention to many issues concerning our life. The truth and falseness of what he said has to be discovered by the individual himself. At the moment of clarity and insight there is no dependence on the teachings.

At the moment of awareness, one experiences a sense of freedom and unknowingly transformation is taking place. All that one needs is to continue one's journey and put energy and vitality into one's clarity of perception. Clarity facilitates the operation of intelligence, which is the basic instrument to wipe away the mess that man has created for himself. When one realizes the significance of clarity one naturally shares it with others.
Let the teachings become part of one's life and then, let go!

According to Krishnamurti, transformation is 'NOW'. In his own words to quote hereinafter:

"Now, is this transformation, is this radical revolution, an ultimate thing, or is it from moment to moment? I know we would like it to be the ultimate thing, because it is so much easier to think in terms of far away. Ultimately we shall be happy, ultimately we shall find truth, but in meantime, let us carry on. Surely, such a mind, thinking in terms of the future, is incapable of acting in the present; and therefore such a mind is not seeking transformation, it is merely avoiding transformation. And what do we mean by transformation?

Transformation is not in the future, can never be in the future. It can only be now, from moment to moment. So, what do we mean by transformation? Seeing the truth in the false, and seeing the false in that which has been accepted as the truth, seeing the false as the false, and the true as the true, is transformation. Because when you see something very clearly as the truth, that truth liberates. When you see that something is false, that false thing drops away. Sir, when you see that ceremonies are mere vain repetitions, when you see the truth of it, and do not justify it, there is transformation, is there not? because another bondage is gone when you see that class distinction is false, that it creates conflict, creates misery, division between people-when you see the truth of it, that very truth liberates. The very perception of that truth is transformation, is it not? And as we are surrounded by so much that is false, perceiving the falseness from moment to moment is transformation. Truth is not cumulative. It is from moment to moment. That which is cumulative, accumulated, is memory, and through memory you can never find truth; for memory is of time-time being the past, the present, and the future. Time, which is continuity, can never find that which is eternal; eternity is not continuity. That which endures is not eternal. Eternity is in the now. The now is not the reflection of the past, nor the continuance of the past, through the present, to the future.

A mind, which is desirous of a future transformation, or looks to transformation as an ultimate end, can never find truth. For truth is a thing that must come from moment to moment, must be discovered anew; and, surely, there can be no discovery through accumulation. How can you discover the new if you have the burden of the old? It is only with the cessation of that burden that you discover the new. So, to discover the new, the
eternal, in the present, from moment to moment, one needs an extraordinarily alert mind, a mind that is not becoming. A mind that is becoming can never know the full bliss of contentment; not the contentment of an achieved result, but the contentment that comes when the mind sees the truth in 'what is' and the false in 'what is'. The perception of that is from moment to moment, and that perception is delayed through verbalization of the moment.

So transformation is not an end result. Transformation is not a result. Result implies, residue, a cause and an effect. Where there is causation, there is bound to be effect. The effect is merely the result of your desire to be transformed. When you desire to be transformed, you are still thinking in terms of becoming; and that which is becoming can never know that which is being. Truth is being from moment to moment, and happiness that continues, is not happiness. Happiness is that state of being which is timeless. That timeless state can come only when there is a tremendous discontent—not the discontent that has found a channel through which it escapes, but the discontent that has no outlet, that has no escape, that is no longer seeking fulfillment. Only then, in that state of supreme discontent, can reality come into being. That reality is not to be brought, to be sold, to be repeated; it cannot be caught in books. It has to be found from moment to moment, in the smile, in the tear, under the dead leaf, in the vagrant thoughts, in the fullness of love. For love is not different from truth. Love is that state in which thought process as time has completely ceased. And where love is, there is transformation. Without love, revolution has no meaning; for then revolution is merely destruction, decay, a greater and greater, ever-mounting misery. Where there is love, there is revolution, because love is transformation from moment to moment.”

[Ref: On Self-knowledge, P. P. 116-18 (Varanasi [Banaras], 1949]

A radiant spiritual personality like J. Krishnamurti was a rare phenomenon, like the flight of an eagle, like the natural flow of the river into the sea, for his way is the simple, direct way of all nature's magnificent phenomena. According to him man is the measure of the world, and that when he transforms himself the world will be at peace. In the transformation of oneself one produces a transformation in society.

He was going around the world trying to point out truth, not doing propaganda. One can propagate an idea, but one cannot propagate truth. It is truth that dissolves the sorrows, the miseries of the world. Every intelligent man wants to see a change in the world and ideals, beliefs, ideologies, dogmas prevent action. It is important to find out what are the impediments, which actually prevent
transformation —a real revolution-not, a revolution of the left or the right, but a fundamental radical revolution not based on ideas. This fundamental revolution or to say, radical transformation is not based on any pattern of action.

"This transformation", declared Krisnamurti (in one of his broadcast in Colombo in January, 1950) is not an abstraction, a thing to be wished for, but an actuality, which can be experienced as we begin to understand the way of our relationship. This fundamental revolution may be called love; it is the only creative factor in bringing about transformation in ourselves and so in society."

Human problems were the same the world over and it was the world problem that Krisnamurti was tackling. Self-knowledge was at the root of philosophy as a breakthrough to the transformation of man.

He went on to explain that only one's own mind was capable of finding out. And that it is only when the mind is creatively empty—not crammed with knowledge, with information, with experience, with memories—that is capable of finding out whether there is an ultimate reality or not. No man can make another happy and that man is his own saviour and redemption does not come from outside. There should be no conformity of any kind, not even reliance upon one's experience of yesterday since every day brings its new conditions.

By living fully in the present one is free from the past, and conquers the future.

The transformation must begin within and not in one's external behaviour. The gathering of one's entire energy to observe and understand oneself brings about an inner transformation, in one's nature and outlook, without this inner transformation, or a spontaneous change of heart, the mere practice of certain disciplines or acts was meaningless. For this, it was necessary to observe oneself dispassionately, like a true scientist, in one's everyday life and relationships, without either condemning or justifying what one observes but with a passion for discovering the truth. Nobody could give one that understanding of the truth, which is essential for an inner transformation.

Here to quote Krisnamurti from the book: 'Meeting Life',
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"When you are observing, seeing the dirt on the road, seeing how the politicians behave, seeing your own attitude towards your wife, your children and so on, transformation is there. To bring about some kind of order in daily life, that is transformation; not something extraordinary, out of this world. When one is not thinking clearly, objectively, rationally, be aware of that and change, break it. That is transformation. When you are greedy, violent, ambitious, trying to become some kind of holy man, see how it is creating a world of tremendous uselessness. If you are jealous watch it, don't give it time to flower, change it immediately. That is transformation. I don't know if you are aware of this. Competition is destroying the world. The world is becoming more and more competitive, more and more aggressive, and if you change it immediately, that is transformation. And if you go very much deeper into the problem, it is clear that thought denies love. Therefore one has to find out whether there is an end to thought, an end to time, not philosophize over it and discuss it, but find out. Truly that is transformation, and if you go into it very deeply, transformation means never a thought of becoming, comparing; it is being absolutely nothing."

[Ref: 'Meeting Life', P.97]

A truly peaceful, non-violent society is only possible if the individual transforms, psychologically, fundamentally. Any other change is trivial; temporary—it will never resolve the problems. All problems that we see in society today are reflections of problems in the psyche of the individual. Therefore, a concern must be with the inner transformation of man and not just the outer organization of society. The individual changes only when his consciousness changes. In order to be able to live in the new consciousness, in the heart of the flame, man must gather his energies, which he has dissipated in all directions, at one point—in the NOW!

If man does not transform inwardly, through a mutation in his psyche, he will soon join the list of those unfortunate creatures that lived a million years or so on this planet and then became extinct for they could not adapt themselves.

To transform the world there must be regeneration within oneself.

Krisnamurti's teaching is centered on the transformation of the mind that lie in the very nature of man, in his inherent intelligence. He speaks on the whole of life as a book of various chapters and says, that for the understanding of that book, to
read that book of life, there is nobody between the reader and the book, no
philosopher, no priest, no guru, no god, nothing:

“You are the book & you are reading it.

Gahe Gahe Isi Pada Kijai
Dil Se Badkar Koi Kitab Nahin!

Actually a mind, that is completely conditioned, cannot grasp spiritual
teaching about Truth, Beauty and Love unless it becomes unconditioned, until it
undergoes a total transformation.

There is no grace from above that can help, until one’s mind is free of all
prejudices, until the seed of truth is planted in one’s consciousness to blossom in
perception of truth, which is from moment to moment.

One cannot talk of J. Krishnamurti’s teaching because he does not set himself
as a teacher and one cannot talk of his philosophy because he would not call himself
a philosopher. He himself says that his is merely a mirror in which to see ourselves.
When once in his lifetime someone associated with his Foundation asked him, what
we could do to spread his (Krishnamurti’s) teachings, his answer was:

“You cannot spread the teaching, you can only spread the word and the word is not the
teaching.”

J. Krishnamurti, thus, communicated his first-hand experiences. These are only
to be grasped by the total understanding, which is called intuition.

Truth, life, is in constant movement. That which is ever-living, ever-moving,
ever-renewing itself, which is timeless, cannot be moulded by words. It has to be
realized; it must be felt, understood, lived. All definitions, all descriptions cannot
contain it.

One must not put what J. Krishnamurti says into one’s old bottles and thus lose
the perfume.

The vital need for change and the possibility of it are surely the essence of
what Krishnamurti has to communicate.

To understand the true significance of life, there must be freedom, which is
not an end, not a result, but the silent state of being that is natural & timeless.
So one cannot speculate about it. When the mind is really quiet, it enters into a dimension, which cannot be put into words. It is obviously a different state of mind from the ordinary mind which works, which is always in movement, which is always caught in thought, thinking, thinking—the whole movement.

One understands something completely when one is quiet. Out of silence there is understanding, not out of one’s chattering.

Thought is time. Thought is born of experience, knowledge, which is inseparable from time. Time is the psychological enemy of man. Through understanding the structure of the self, the timeless, the immeasurable, comes into being. Thoughts, Krishnamurti said, are the cause of sorrow, but one has not to suppress them, escape from them to fight them. One has to be choicelessly aware of them, of every thought. Awareness is from moment to moment and cannot be cultivated.

To live in this world one must deny the world. By that Krishnamurti means, deny the idea of the war, the competition, the envy, conflict and so on. To live in this world sanely, there must be a radical change of the mind and of the heart. Krishnamurti has thus to say on this important point like this: one must have intense passion for radical transformation of life. To take things as they come, one must be free from “I”, “me”, free from self-centered activity always concerning about oneself, one’s failures & fulfillment. Then one can live from moment to moment, without struggle, without conflict. To negate so called living, which is ugly, lonely, brutal, violent, is most positive action one should not be afraid of being “nothing”:

*Bandgi Aur Hakprasti Kuchh Na Hona Hai “Niazi“*  
*Kuchh Na Hone Ke Siva Aur Hakprasti Kuchh Nahin.*

One is afraid to let go of all things one has known. And the demand to be safe in relationship inevitably breeds sorrow and fear. This belonging to another, being psychologically nourished by another, depending on another, in all this there must be anxiety, fear, jealousy, guilt. In this, there is no love.

No kind of social reform could ever be the answer to the fundamental question of human misery, while living in the world, where self-interest is increasing tremendously.
The inward house, the house in which the mind lives, can be put in order only when there is no conflict and no effort. Therefore, meditation, according to J. Krishnamurti, is to put one's house in order and he says that meditation is nothing other than the understanding and the transformation of the daily life of a human being. Because to be very alert, very alive, one must be totally free from all dependence. When a mind is occupied with things that are dead, - i.e. one's past achievements, burden of knowledge, information and systems that are dead, the mind will also be dead.

That is why until man himself changed radically, inwardly, all other change was like scratching the surface and therefore useless & irrelevant.

An individual and the world are not two different entities. "You are the world", says Krishnamurti, "as the world is yourself, in the transformation of yourself, you produce transformation of society." He always laid emphasis on the individual.

The gist of his teaching in his own words, as the core of Krishnamurti's teaching, is contained in the statement he made in 1929 when he said, "Truth is a pathless land". Man cannot come to it through any organization, through any creed, through any priest, ritual. The man has to find the truth through the mirror of relationship, through the understanding of the content of his own mind, through observation. Man has built in himself images as a fence of security-religious, political and personal. The burden of these dominates man's thinking, relationships and daily life. These are the causes of our problems for they divide man from man in every relationship. The contents of his consciousness are this consciousness.

That is what Krishnamurti has been saying that one has to find out, through right education, this source of one's being which is imperishable, for then there will always be this extraordinary creativity, freedom, which is not a reaction, which is not choice. In observation one begins to discover the lack of freedom-freedom that is found in the choiceless awareness of our daily existence. When one becomes aware of the movement of his consciousness he will see the division between the thinker and the thought, the observer and the observed. He will discover that this division is an illusion. Then only is there insight. That timeless insight brings about a deep radical change. Then one will never be depressed, will never feel lonely.
“Total negation is the essence of the positive. When there is negation of all those things which are not love-desire pleasure-then love is, with it’s compassion and intelligence. [October 21, 1980] [Ref: Krishnamurti: ‘The years of Fulfilment’ PP: 204-205]

In 1985, few months before his death J. Krishnamurti confided to his posthumous biographer: Pupul Jayakar, that since 1929, there has been no change in his teaching.

J. Krishnamurti laid great emphasis on transformation of mind in meditation. For him meditation is the ending of “me”. It is emptying the consciousness of its contents. Without meditation the heart becomes a desert, a wasteland. Yet, if somebody asked him, how to meditate or how to end the sorrow, he will say, “There is no “how”. You yourself have to understand and the understanding will have its own action.”

Fritz Capra, a famous Scientist, in his book: “Uncommon Wisdom” (P. 28) records with gratitude a very illumination conversation. He asks Krishnamurti How can I be a Scientist and still follow your advice of stopping thought and attaining freedom from the known? Krishnamurti without a moment’s hesitation answered in a way, he completely dissolved the question and solved his problem: “First you are a human being, then you are a Scientist. First you have to become free and this freedom cannot be achieved through thought. It is achieved through meditation, the understanding of the totality of life in which every form of fragmentation has ceased’.

In J. Krishnamurti, the 20th Century saw a great spiritual master, who for more than half a century travelled ceaselessly all over the world (till his death in 1986) giving talks and holding discussions, not as a Guru but as a lover of truth. He was a Seer who walked alone. He lived what he taught and never compromised. His central teaching is “when you are, the other is not. Ending of “me” is the beginning of wisdom.”

His philosophy attracted such figures as Bernard Shaw, Leopold stockwski, Aldous Huxley, Dr. David Bohm & Pt. J. L. Nehru

The teaching of J. Krishnamurti propounded which was not guided by the Teaching of any of the accepted problems and indeed even rejected them. According to him his Teaching does not involve faith but a mind that is free to examine. The
preconceived notions and ideas impede a clear vision of what J. Krishnamurti was trying to show us in his talks, writings and conversations all along his life.

In consequence, his teachings are not a philosophy, not a system of thought, and not an ideology as he said insistingly that all organized religions are forms of escape. They offer comfort, which is a block to understanding. He was always pointing out that truth can only be experienced directly at the moment it happens. That is why any intellectual projection of the Truth is a step a way from the truth. One must understand this by direct experience, without interpretation and without intellectual jargon. For the thought and the word are not the thing, but a distortion of the reality. The spoken or written word is not the truth.

J. Krishnamurti, the Seer of the Seers of the contemporary world, through his talks and writing, and more his sheer silent presence, has reminded the world once again that there is a consciousness which can permeate space, transcend time, bring peace, harmony and love in this conflict-ridden world. His is a voice of deep silence, not without deeper investigation into the mind, the mind understood in all its ramifications from the physical brain to the processes of thought, to insight and intelligence.

The relationship of the observer and the observed is basic to Krishnamurti’s investigation as much as is his insistence on the recognition that the mind of man is conditioned by the movement of the past and the moment of freedom is the moment when Man becomes capable of being unconditioned.

Perhaps the most difficult thing to achieve in saying that the observer should understand his conditioning as an outsider and be aware of being conditioned, Krishnamurti has already asked even more basic question, “Can thought be aware of itself?”

“Seeing that which is false is the awakening of intelligence”, startles one to the revelation that ‘thought conditions’, ‘intelligence awakens.’

J. Krishnamurti, who challenges dead habit and conditioned functioning at the individual and collective level, every time makes us aware that intelligence is the moment of insight without conditioning, without memory and time.
Unlike other thinkers J. Krishnamurti draws our attention to the fact that the crisis is not in morality or values at all but in the consciousness and knowledge. What havoc has knowledge created? Unless human beings radically transform this consciousness, they are going to end up in bloody wars.

Man has lived for twenty-five thousand years from what modern discovery has shown. During these 250 centuries, he has not radically changed. Man is anxious, frightened, depressed, unhappy, aggressive, lonely and all that. The crises are there and the crises are in the modern knowledge. Freedom from the known can only take place when one has observed the whole phenomenon of working in the field of the known. Then, in the very investigation of the known, from that comes freedom from the known, and insight is freedom from the known first, which implies no remembrances of the past.

J. Krishnamurti probes into what constitutes physical and psychological time and brings us to a unity, a unity which considers the division between outer and inner as false. The outer is the indicator of the inner and the vice versa. To him, religious life is a life, which is holistic in which there is total insight into the whole structure and nature of consciousness.

J. Krishnamurti provides a new direction to those of us seeking an alternative way of living and does indicate that the key to regeneration is emptying the mind of all the past, which is knowledge.

A careful reading of Krishnamurti’s teachings born of a life-time experience, will challenge and disturb, our slumber, but if we will just let go and allow the fullness of emptiness, it will no doubt open doors of perception, spark insights— which may transform brain cells and make them capable of being unconditioned and that will be the beginning of Transformation of Man, a task no computer can accomplish.

J. Krishnamurti was truly one of the finest thinkers of the twentieth century. He personified the liberation of religion from conventional shackles and makes no divisions between the worldly and the religious life. His vision of life is holistic, and according to him, religion is not separate from life but on the contrary it is life itself.
J. Krishnamurti’s notions of holistic living remain as beautiful and vibrant as when he was alive. What he asked was that we look with awareness, for it is thought which manipulates our lives so totally, that creates every crisis that we live as victims of thought rather than as beings who can think.

His basic insights are based on the spontaneous perception of the human predicament, which propounds that while thought is necessary in practical matters, it is deadly in relationship. The thought that created the problem is fragmented, so that the solution when it is arrived at becomes a problem in itself. The thinking that creates problems cannot resolve them. What is required is a way of looking which Krishnamurti called “holistic”.

He spoke of a way of seeing so that only what is necessary is held by the mind and the rest is drained away leaving the brain unburdened. Hence there is freedom of thought. Man rarely experiences freedom being driven by his past. Being attached to the past, one does not and cannot experience love. When the brain is unburdened of the past; it has extraordinary energy, which is compassion. And this is the state that is according to J. Krishnamurti, holistic-holy, and the human being functions as complete entity. Repeatedly, he draws attention to the necessity of moving from the individual to that, which is the universal. It is only when there is a movement beyond the individual and the particular that it is possible to observe totally, is not to allow thought to interfere with that what is being perceived totally.

J. Krishnamurti offered his listeners the opportunity to live freely, not mechanically. He lived free from encumbrances himself and offered the same burdenlessness to those who would choose it.

His insistence on a state of not knowing is fundamental because it is in that state of not knowing that one may come to the point of utter emptiness of not knowing—a moment when the brain may not be occupied with itself.

What makes the dialogues of Krishnamurti profound and meaningful is that he investigates outside the parameters of a theoretical, intellectual position. His insistence is on the experiencing, not the theory and words. His concern is to recognize perception without remembrance. He reminded us that the moment there is such a perception taking place actually and not theoretically, there is tremendous
energy, boundless energy, not energy created by thought, but energy, which is a totally different kind of energy which then acts.

That energy for Krishnamurti is compassion, love. Then that love and compassion are intelligence and that intelligence acts. The distinction that has been made by him, between thought and intelligence is of the utmost importance because normally one believes that it is thought which leads to intelligence or vice-versa.

In the twenty-first century, man is forever living in the shadow of an imminent apocalypse. Traditional values and perceptions no longer hold good. And in these catastrophic circumstances humanity looks up to its Seers to provide the answers to tide over this crisis. When Man himself is fragmented, always wanting, always lacking, how can he ‘look’, perceive and think so that he is not driven by his own desires?

Here comes J. Krishnamurti, one of the foremost spiritual teachers of our age, (---to call him a philosopher would be to limit him) discussed some of these burning issues with people from various disciplines. He tried with intensity to get people to take responsibility for their lives for the mess around them. In exploring the fundamental questions of life and for growing inwardly into a state of an insight, he focussed relentlessly on the importance of being aware of our daily life and actions without depending on anyone for the understanding of life in the sense of its flowering.

He tried to make us see that no saviour would come and make the world ‘all right’:--- We have to do it ourselves, with compassion for everyone and everything. He speaks on the whole of various chapters and says that for the understanding of that book, to read that book of life,-----there is nobody between the reader and the book, no philosopher no priest, no guru, no guide, no god, nothing. ("You are the book, and you are reading it!")

Today when the world is passing through difficult times wherein everything becomes a Crisis, deepning crisis even threatening the survival of humanity,----- J. Krishnamurti is even more valid. His notion of completeness, non-fragmentation, make perhaps even more sense now when solutions to world problems are sought through setting up committees of people who have almost no involvement in the
problems themselves. The chaos one sees around must be addressed by the kind of 'holistic' perception J. Krishnamurti advocated, whose vision of life is holistic.

J. Krishnamurti's teaching is centred on the transformation of the mind that lie in the very nature of man, in his inherent intelligence. In his most original and uncommon style of presentation, this one of the most popular spiritual teachers of modern times, touched the core of the problems of daily living that comfort every human being by revealing thereby the subtle process of enquiring into oneself; a process as simple and wonderful as opening one's eyes to the full beauty of life.

J. Krishnamurti in discussion with a group of eminent people on the deepning crisis of humanity speaks thus as excerpted from the book: "The way of Intelligence:"

"......Has knowledge transformed man at all, at any time? This is the real crisis, and the crisis is in modern knowledge. What havoc has knowledge played? Has it any place at all in the transformation of man? That is the real question. We have to understand, not intellectually, not verbally, but deep down in our being the nature of our consciousness and this tremendous accumulation of knowledge in the last hundred and fifty years, whether that has brought about the destruction of man, or the ascent of man, or if it has any place at all in the transformation of man."

"......What consciousness is, and what is the nature of knowledge? These two factors apparently are dominating the world. Thought is knowledge. Knowledge is experience. Knowledge, memory, thought, action—this is the cycle man has been caught in for twenty-five thousand years. This cycle has been a process of accumulating knowledge and functioning from that knowledge, either skillfully or un-skillfully. The process is stored in the brain as memory, and the memory responds in action. This is the cycle in which man is caught; always within the field of the known. Now what will change man? That is one problem.

The other is consciousness. Consciousness is its content; its content makes up consciousness. All the superstitions, beliefs, the class divisions, the brahmanic impressions all that falls within consciousness. The idol, the belief, the idea of god, suffering, pain, anxiety, loneliness, despair, depression, uncertainty, insecurity, all that is within human consciousness. It is not my consciousness; it is human consciousness, because wherever you go, America, or Russia, you meet the same problem. Human beings carry this complex burden of consciousness, which contains all the things that thought has put together.
"...When you examine your own consciousness whether you are a doctor a scientist, a philosopher, a guru, you find your own anxieties, your uncertainties—all that is your consciousness. And that consciousness is the ground on which all humanity stands."

[Ref: The way of Intelligence by J. Krishnamurti publ. by K. F. I. 1985]

To J. Krishnamurti, the old brain, stuffed with the past, the words of others, the authority of organized religion and fragmented in time, cannot solve the enormous problem of living.

The refusal to accept any organized authority, the distrust of the past, the insistence on "what is", the emphasis on understanding oneself in the totality of being and, finally, the equation of seeing and acting are all certainly inlaid in Krishnamurti's own experience of freedom.

To both J. Krishnamurti and the Existentialists, the final essence of being is determined by the individual as a human being, with the full awareness that a life has its repercussions on others even as the others affect the one in isolation. In other words, there is thus the need for proceeding together, the realization that all life is relationship and that freedom, without fear, alone will ensure a living mind in all.

The individual is not the same as human being. The individual belongs to a patterned society. The human being is everywhere. All life is relationship.

One should seek in the very essence of one's being a total revolution, a mutation of the psyche. One should learn to live with oneself, having fully understood oneself. The movement is always new. It is only a mind capable of living totally in the present that has no fear.

To be alone, one must die to the past. When one is alone, totally alone, not belonging to the family, any nation, any culture, any particular continent, there is that sense of being an outsider. The man who is completely alone in this way is innocent and it is this innocence that frees the mind from sorrow. To seek a repetition of an experience, on the other hand, is to walk the path of sorrow.

Here, Krishnamurti is of course, dealing essentially with transformation of the mind. If one had the perception to see it, one's seeing itself would have given the ability to act instantaneously and remain free.
To begin at the beginning, the first thing to learn, according to J. Krishnamurti, is not to seek. One has to know oneself, understand oneself. That is the beginning of wisdom.

As according to him, one must begin with the individual. If the individual transforms himself, his life, then for him there is freedom: and because he is the result of a total process, when he liberates himself from nationalism, from greed, from exploitation, he has direct action upon the whole.

According to J. Krishnamurti "individual problem is the world problem." Without the regeneration of individual, there can be no fundamental revolution in feeling, thinking and thereby in action as a unitary process. The world can be changed only by the change taking place in the individual in the present, not in the utopian future, only here not elsewhere. Suffering cannot be overcome through any belief or through any pattern of action. No leader, political or religious can bring about order in ourselves. Each one of us has to understand the confusion and sorrow that is in us, which we project into the world. This projection is society with its violence and degradation. So the emphasis should be laid on the conflict within the individual. For the inner, the psychological, will always overcome the outer. Such an understanding is a total process as augmented by J. Krishnamurti.

Thus, Diligently and intensively with fervour, one must put himself to the task of self-transformation.

What matters is that we should live completely at every moment of our lives. That is the only real liberation. The only life worth dealing with is our present life and every one of its moments.

As Insight is to perceive something instantly, it must act instantly.

As an embodiment of his own teachings, J. Krishnamurti tirelessly emphasized the primacy and urgency of a total radical transformation of the human psyche as a pre-requisite for an entirely different social order. No kind of social reform could ever be the answer to the fundamental question of human misery & sorrow. Until man himself changed radically, all other change was useless and irrelevant. To live in this world sanely, there must be a radical change of the mind and of the heart. One must have intense passion for radical transformation of life;
one must negate all spiritual authority, authority of the guru, the book, or tradition. The total responsibility lay with the individual, as no one could free another from bondage. No man from outside can make one free.

The purpose of existence is to go beyond the self-centered activity of the mind. The true meaning of life is to be a light to oneself. This light cannot be given by another. One has to set out to find oneself the purpose of life without the authority of another. There is no need for any discipline, any teacher, any guru, any system to see the immense mystery in living—in the love of living.

In his many years of discussion with people from all parts of society and in public talks to large audience all over the world, J. Krishnamurti always laid stress on the individual and spoke of the need for one to look inward, to know oneself, if one is to understand individual, and therefore society’s deep-rooted conflicts, for the individual chaos creates the global disorder. It is, thus, very important to uncover for oneself what one actually is, not according to the theories and experiences of psychologists, philosophers and the priests, but rather by seeing what one actually is, as though one is looking at oneself in a mirror, psychologically, thereby bringing about a transformation in the very structure of oneself. When one deeply, fundamentally, brings about such a mutation, then that mutation affects the whole consciousness of man.

The very seeing of what one is, is the beginning of the transformation. To see what one actually is, it is vital to be free from the whole content of one’s consciousness. Freedom from psychological authority is absolutely necessary.

As J. Krishnamurti speaks as early as in 1929, in Banaras Star camp:

“To discover the true purpose of life, you must be free of all traditions of thought, whether ancient or modern, laid down by another, even if he has achieved. It is, after all, the individual who is hungry that must concern himself with his hunger.”

Man is so heavily conditioned from the early life to achieve something in this society in order to be successful while enclosing oneself in a circle. But a serious person observing what life is in its enormity in its psychological sphere, must find out the purpose of life through his active, alive participation and right communication in the whole of life. In order to set off a spark of consciousness in the
men who are sinking in the river of time, drowning in the ocean of delusion, it is only ourselves who can make anything really worthwhile of our lives. This is to know oneself as one is from moment to moment. One must not wish anything other than what happens from moment to moment. To look to the future, to strain after an ideal, indicates a desire to avoid the present. Such an understanding, as according to J. Krishnamurti—a unique spiritual radicalist, who doesn’t instruct but awakens, becomes very important to bring about a transformation in the human mind, in order to create a new world, a new society. When the mind revolts within to discover what is true, and it is the movement of truth that creates a new world, one must give up the worship of the image and fall in love with life.

J. Krishnamurti, who negates all systems and methods on enquiring about truth, points out that first step is the last step implying by it that it is possible to change ourselves radically whatever age we are, observing the fact of whatever we are at that moment, not over a period of time but instantaneously, and by changing ourselves, to change the whole structure of society, and of our relationship. This perception of a whole life immediately, is the only thing to do, —to change completely, radically, immediately. To do that one has to observe with all one’s heart and mind, not escaping into anything.

Then there is a radical change——the vital need and the possibility of it are the essence of what Krishnamurti has to communicate, as one who offered a totally different and fresh approach to the problems of life, and a challenge to understand how mankind has made life the difficult mess we are all caught in.

One has to be serious in putting aside all ‘isms’ or beliefs with one breath, for only one who is vitally serious can fathom the voice of the heart of one of the wisest men of our era—J. Krishnamurti, only if it is supported by courage of conviction and trust in life in order to live a life that is whole and complete. The mind that is serious must be free to observe,—free of the dead weight of the past which is knowledge, experience, tradition, which is accumulated memory, the past. It means, in tune with J. Krishnamurti, to die to everything inwardly, to all ambition and everything that one has accumulated psychologically. When one dies to all that, with no shadow of conflict or hypocrisy in it, then the mind is completely new, fresh and innocent.
When man is no longer escaping, he listens to everything. It is the readiness of the mind that is wisdom.

He who knows others is learned; he who knows himself is wise! Man must liberate himself. To the wise man nothing is trivial. Every moment is significant!

_Dam- Bai-Dam Lehza Bai-Lehza Nao- Bai-Nao Hai Zindagi_  
_Zindagi Main Zindagi Ki Justjoo Hai Zindagi!_
Krishnamurti, an eminent non-conformist and spiritual revolutionary of our times, though cannot be compared with any other religious thinker or spiritual philosopher owing to an original approach based on his own direct experience; yet in its bare essentials his teaching may be similar or identical with what others have proclaimed before him.

As Krishnamurti invites an individual human being to come back to himself; his teaching can never be labelled under any philosophical connotation or religious concept, being primarily a plea for self-help and a pointer to an insight into the simple truth of living—a path, yet not of time, that is basically the same as the direct approach and an undogmatic view-point propounded by the Japanese form of Buddhism i.e. viz. Zen Buddhism. (It is not out of place to add that Zen experience is no different from the insight attained by such great religious men as Buddha, Christ, Krishna, Lao-tse & others).

Zen, if not considered an another system of knowledge and shorn of its institutionalized practices and recognized as a way of liberation, and an approach to truth and reality on a non-sectarian basis, is essentially akin to the spirit of Krishnamurti —As Krishnamurti and Zen are in essence the same thing, the same teaching, although using different modes of expression. Both are not teachings in the actual sense of the word but pointers to an immediate transformation of man (attaining Buddha-hood or a state of satori), which become intelligible only in the process of self-discovery or through complete self-knowledge.

Zen, the Japanese form of Buddhism, which has developed from a crossbreed of Taoism and the Mahayana school of Buddhism, is neither simply a religion nor a philosophy. It is life itself. It is a special transmission outside the scriptures; it does not depend upon texts. Zen does not waste time with dissertations on abstruse notions such as God, or Truth, what requires of its disciples is to look upon their own faces: ‘Outside teaching; apart from tradition not founded on words and letters. Pointing directly to the human mind seeing into one’s nature and attaining Buddhahood.’
The essential spirit of Zen is living, dynamic-non-conformist and non-traditionalist. Zen is not understood, it is lived.

True to spirit of one of the fundamentally revolutionary attitudes of Zen and Krishnamurti we have tried to fathom the spirit of freedom from dependence on scriptures & texts for it is in tune with the advice of Buddhidharma, founder of Zen, when he said to his disciples: “Do not let yourself be upset by the sutra, but rather upset the sutra yourself.” This proves beyond doubt, of the anti-traditionalism of the Zen masters and Krishnamurti, which states that we cannot learn wisdom from books or teachers. Krishnamurti is heard to have stated it often-times vehemently that the person who verbally repeats a truth, is stating a lie.

Like Krishnamurti the Zen masters and patriarchs as Bodhi-Dharma and Hui-Neng and many other Zen masters were great revolutionaries and mostly and vehemently denounced the vanity of metaphysical quarrels and absurdity of intellectual preoccupations and Jargonism, giving vent to the non-conformists attitude and living experience.

In words of Robert Linssen, “Today independent thinkers and non-Buddhists such as krishnamurti are laying the new basis of the most complete spiritual revolution known up till now.” Again he reviews the position in these words: - “The role of transcendental wisdom consists not in conditioning the human mind, but in liberating it. All doctrines using symbols and mental clichés enslave it by leading it imperceptibly into a process of imitation, which is all the more serious in that it is subtle.”

In the illuminating pages of “Living Zen”, Robert Linssen reproduces precisely the attitude adopted by Zen masters in these words: “The first purity of the experience of the sages cannot be transmitted by the prestige of a tradition or supposed revelation. It must be wholly created by living experience.”

The Zen masters have exceeded verbal expression in order to live the wisdom they seek to express. The essence of Zen being freedom, attachment to any ideas is contrary to freedom. The spirit of freedom has been defined clearly in a Zen counsel: “The perfect way knows no difficulties except that it refuses to make preferences. A tenth of an inch’s difference and Heaven & Earth are set apart.” As it is, we could define Zen as spiritual free thinking.
Such an attitude of freedom and non-conditioning of the mind is highly recommended by Zen and Krishnamurti in the real sense for the integrated men who no longer identify themselves with any system of thought and are free from all personal attachment to a particular belief. They are dead to themselves, and only LIFE commands in them.

To Zen and the unconventional sage of our times—J. Krishnamurti, the supreme Reality is LIFE. They equally teach us, besides, that the supreme Reality is not outside us and that true spirituality lies beyond forms and symbols and can only be realized in absence of premeditation, in spontaneity and immediacy of the mind.

True sages of all times have suggested a sudden reversal of all the values with which we have become identified through force of habit. This requirement of renewal is to be found, more particularly in Krishnamurti’s teaching that it seems to be most urgent.

The essential law of Life is a law of renewal of pure creativeness & change.

Thus, the aim of the Zen masters on one hand, and Krishnamurti, on the other, is to free man from the yoke of mental servitude in which he is held through the force of habit.

As Krishnamurti said, "the new facts of each instant are corrupted by the old habits of which the 'I-process' is the sum-total and the living incarnation. Man's urgent task, therefore, is to break through this sterile cycle of the force of habit. Without the thoughts the thinker does not exists," says Krishnamurti.

Again, Robert Linsen very lucidly sums up the whole thing in one paragraph: "From the moment when the 'thinker' understands, he is silent, stopping he looks more serenely within himself and into all things. 'Tanha', the thirst for 'becoming' is in the point of extinction. The tensions in order to 'become' are replaced by the relaxation of THAT WHICH IS. It is the hour of the 'letting go' of which the Zen masters speak. The death of the entity of the 'thinker' is succeeded by the plenitude of Life." [Ref: Living Zen]

The great strength of Zen on the one hand, and of J. Krishnamurti’s standpoint on the other lies in the fact that they are not systems of thought, but statements of a way of living freed of all ideations & imbued with the direct method of approach.
Zen and Krishnamurti’s teachings are not philosophic in the general sense of the term, but rather a way of living. They can neither be considered systems of ideas or metaphysics, nor have they any place for dogmas, doctrines or disciplines, or for symbols, rituals and principles.

Both Zen and Krishnamurti deny spiritual authority and oppose psychological dependence of any form. There is no ‘method’ for either of them. There is no method for as Zen tells us, “we ourselves are Reality”. Krishnamurti develops exactly the same point of views in a work with the significant title of “Pathless Reality”.

Both of them insist on the fundamental fact that we have nothing to do, that we have no spiritual edifice to raise as according to their standpoint we do not have to ‘become’ anything else, but be fully aware of the self, of what we are. Both Zen & Krishnamurti insist our self-knowing and advocate the inexistence of the ‘I-Process’ or ‘thinker’. Krishnamurti emphatically said that all our attention should be brought to bear on the process of thought itself and not on the thinker. The clear vision of the process of thought is one of the fundamental basis of Krishnamurti’s teachings.

In fact Krishnamurti teaches us that Truth is free and unconditioned and one must approach it by effectively freeing one’s mind from its manifold conditioning as memory habits, attachment to ideas, beliefs, images, cult of authority and dogmas or ritualism if it is to reveal to one its full richness and harmonious integration.

Both in Zen and Krishnamurti’s teachings, the craving for ‘becoming’ or ‘Tanha’ is considered as the main bondage or conditioning factor as the dominating element in our bondage.

The spirit of Zen, like that of Krishnamurti, has no resort to the cult of any spiritual authority of the masters, traditions & disciplines. Besides both of them denounce the vain pursuits of moral qualities or any search for virtues. For, virtue, purity and austerity are not means but consequences.

In nutshell, Zen and Krishnamurti’s teaching are the highest expression of the spiritual thought as they encourage individuals to free themselves from sacred texts, rituals, precepts and traditional methods of realization. They require one to free
oneself from all outer or inner authority, including that of memories accumulated by one’s own past.

The highest mission of man is to manifest the fullness of his being and with this perspective, J. Krishnamurti clearly denounces the conflicts & suffering imposed on oneself by one’s refusal to look at oneself actually as one is in being new in each new instant as it is the universal expression of the Intelligence of Life in its adequacy.

So far as Zen is concerned, it is not religion—neither is it something lofty or remote.

If one has to say anything about what Zen “is”, one could say that it is the poetry of life—Everyday life.

The familiar Zen saying, “Before enlightenment, I chopped wood and carried water, after enlightenment, I chopped wood and carried water”, tells one all one needs to know.

The true lover of life has no philosophy, for his is truly free!

Now what is Zen point of view? There is nothing systematized in Zen. One may try if one wishes, but Zen comes of itself. True Zen shows in everyday living consciousness in action. More than any limited awareness, it opens every inner door to our infinite nature.

Zen compares all teaching with a finger that points at the moon, and it puts us unceasingly on guard against the mistake of placing the accent of Reality on this finger which is only a means and which, in itself has no importance.

Zen is a universal point of view, offered to all, imposed on none. It detests every kind of intellectuality. Doubtless, the ultimate, the real point of view, cannot be expressed in words. True to the Krishnamurti’s saying in this context: “In the pursuit of self-expression the love of life is lost. First love life, then the expression of that love will come as sweetly as the flight of a young bird.”

Zen says, ‘There is nothing complicated that Man needs to do; it is enough that he see directly into his own nature.’

The idea of direct method is to get hold of this fleeting life as it flees and not after it has flown. While it is fleeing, there is no time to recall memory or to build ideas. Nothing is permanent except change and understanding of life is always immediate, new, in the instant.
To the disciple who asks for the way of wisdom the Zen Master replies: "when you are hungry you eat; when you are tired you lie down."

Thus, the Zen point of view does not consist in a certain angle of vision, but comprises all possible angles.

According to Zen: "The perfect way knows no difficulty except that it denies itself any Preference ...... A difference of a tenth of an inch and Heaven & Earth, are thereby separated."

Zen tells man that he is free now; he has only the illusion of chains. Man will enjoy his freedom as soon as he ceases to believe that he needs to free himself. It says: "Search not for the truth; only cease to cherish opinions."

Zen says that the slavery of man resides in his desire to exist. The direct perception of existential reality, in the present moment casts into the void all the imaginative phantoms concerning a past or a future without present reality.

For Zen, the normal spontaneous evolution of man results in SATORI—the instant at which every limitation disappears and at which one is united with the all. The natural life according to Zen, can thus be called ‘the life of the “old” man’, the normal life ‘the life of the “new” man’, Zen says as is also frequently found in Krishnamurti’s saying that it is necessary, to die in order to be reborn.

Zen affirms: "SATORI comes to us unexpectedly when we have exhausted all the resources of our being."

We are not able to see the man who has attained realization otherwise than as a man who has become absolutely ordinary:

{Gain & loss, right & wrong, Away with them once & for all!}

LinChi [a d. A. D. 866] – a Rinzai Zen Master said: "The self far transcends all things. Even if heaven and earth tumbled down, I would have no misgivings. Even though all the Buddhas in ten directions appeared before me, I would not rejoice. Even though the three hells appeared before me, I would have no fear.

Why is it like this?
Because there is nothing I dislike!"

Zen says to us: "Look straight into your own nature”. This way of looking depends on the opening of the third eye.”
The necessary inner task, in Zen connotation, does not consist in ‘doing’ anything whatever, but in ‘undoing’ something, in ‘undoing’ all the illusory egotistical beliefs which tightly closed the lid of the “third eye”.

It is just as to obtain one day the ‘sudden’ release of vision into one’s own nature. Zen says here: “Be entirely detached from everything.” And that: “the inner task requires an activity, faultlessly attentive, as if we had our head in the fire.”

The Zen masters say to us not in any event hinder or disturb the course of life. The man who works according to Zen can work inwardly all day, without this work comprising the slightest spiritual ‘exercise’, the least intentional discriminative reflection, the slightest rule of moral conduct, the least trouble to do ‘good’.

The man who has become really desperate, who no longer expects anything from the world of phenomena, is flooded by the perfect joy. Having lost the worldliness, he has regained its essence-transitoriness of its manifested forms and norms in its entirety. To his vision, the utility of life lies in its futility. Then one can’t help living humbly, in wonder.

Thus, the apex of religious experience in Zen is enlightenment—the experience of SATORI, which is considered the very quintessence of Zen.

The experience of SATORI is the highest peak and deepest core of Zen, but at the same time Zen encompasses many dimensions of human life.

Zen is practice, experience, life—not explaining interpreting, investigating, quibbling. All talk is at best a finger pointing to the moon. The finger is not the moon and cannot pull the moon down.

“What is Zen?”

One answer: Sufi Inayat Khan tells an ancient story of a fish who went to a queen fish and asked: “I have always heard about the sea, but what is this sea? Where is it?

The queen fish explained: “You live, move, and have your being in the sea. The sea is within you and you are made of sea, and you will end in sea. The sea surrounds you as your own being.”
It can be summed up to say that Zen is a religion to live-by— it comes of itself and shows in everyday living. It is a consciousness in action, which opens every inner door to the infinite nature, to the plenitude of life.

That plenitude comes from Nothingness, for Nothingness is indistinguishably at one with perfect Being.

The reality of life or its plenitude is the infinite source of all things. It is not outside man but within. No one can save man, except man himself. No one can redeem man but himself.

This remains the common theme and it the core of what J. Krishnamurti and Zen Buddhism meant to the mankind:

Life cannot be communicated through words, it must be lived! The Supreme Reality is "nothingness," for it is indefinable and indescribable. Because no philosophy, no thought can hold it, as conceived by man.

This is the great paradox of Zen, and of Life. The very negation which seems implied in "nothingness,"— the Void, signifies at once its absolute confirmation. Only when one is nothing in oneself can there be complete harmony with a Reality which is just "becoming like nothing," i.e. the cessation of all conflict and contradiction in the mind.

And how can one be free to discover if one is tethered to some formula, a belief, an assumption or an ideal?
"A guest am I in the world of transient things
Unfettered by entanglements thereof
I am of no country
No boundaries hold me"!

-------J. Krishnamurti-------

"Man Vairagi Maya Tyagi,
Shabad Main Surt Samai
Kahai kabir Suno Bhai Sadho,
Yeh Gam Birlai Pai"!

-------Kabir-------

At the age of 14, J. Krishnamurti was discovered by Charles Leadbeater on the beach at the Bay of Bengal, to be groomed as the world teacher. He was hailed as the "Coming Messiah" by the spiritual organization that nurtured him. At the age of 34, after twenty years of careful grooming for this position, he renounced the role, went his own way to proclaim, "I maintain that truth is a pathless land and you cannot approach it by any path whatsoever, by any religion, by any sect. Truth being limitless, unconditioned, unapproachable, cannot be organized nor should any organization be formed to lead or coerce people along any particular path. If you first understand that then you will see how impossible it is to organize a belief. A belief is purely an individual matter and you cannot and must not organize it – if you do it, it becomes dead, crystallised; it becomes a creed, a sect, a religion to be imposed on others."

He spent almost sixty years of the rest of his life travelling around the world, teaching and speaking to an ever-increasing number of listeners of all ages, races & nationalities with a remarkable insight to penetrate to the very essence of human problems, he himself had shed the burden of the past, each day was to be a fresh discovery of joy with the passionate energy of freedom, continued on his way as a teacher of the world. He thus came to the rescue of crisis-ridden humanity and has given it valuable teachings. Most of his teachings are in the form of dialogues. It was only through "Commentaries on Living" [3 volumes series] that Krishnamurti began sharing his inner processes with the readers. There is a long list of books, which speak about J. Krishnamurti—the man and his teaching.

His whole fabric of thought or philosophy is probably closest to that of Saint Kabir.
Kabir, about five centuries farther from J. Krishnamurti, both speak of transcending the limits of the mind. And there is more than in common between these two outstanding individuals. They lived in two different worlds yet there are striking parallels in their streams of thought. Both men expressed their experiences in almost identical terms through lectures and discussions.

Kabir, the weaver, is a practical man. His blunt but skilful fingers play with our minds, churning things up, and exposing falsehoods from outer deceptions to inner delusions. He knows that the growth of honesty or courage has its own gathering momentum, and he trusts the outcome. It is out of this faith that he acts like a teacher, striving to shake his listeners out of their false security, their callous dishonesty, their naïve belief that they actually possess and will continue to possess house, body, mate, family or even a mind, which Kabir portrays as a nervous thief or a dog howling at its own reflection. He confronts, irritates and fascinates, always trying to set off a spark of consciousness in people who are sinking in the river of time, drowning in the ocean of delusion.

Though separated by a span of five centuries, another thinker of our own era, J. Krishnamurti gives us a similar explanation for the world’s problems. He maintains that the source of all problems-economic, social or political-is psychological. And asserts that we can remove psychological hindrances only by gaining personal insight into them.

There are many such intersections between the two. What Kabir sensed, Krishnamurti saw. Kabir lived at a time when the outer conditions of life were changing, but very slowly. In his time the world witnessed a gradual shift in values. Although the ravages of industrialization and a mechanistic way of life were still distant, the sensitive Seer could sense what was to come and he warned people in his own characteristic way.

J. Krishnamurti lived in an industrial age, when mechanization and materialism had engulfed all walks of life. And where under the crumbling values which had sustained humanity through the ages, life was losing its meaning. He raised his voice against this threat to civilization.
Kabir's teachings have two aspects: Psychic aspect and the spiritual (a mystic) one. Most of his followers consider the first as more important than the second. On the other hand, there is a distinct mysticism in the thoughts of J. Krishnamurti. Both were non-dualistic in their approach. The problem of human relationships was the main theme of their discourses. Many people believe that Krishnamurti's teachings are an endless string of negations. And the same insinuation of being an iconoclast is held against Kabir.

Despite the similarity in their iconoclastic ideas and approach there is a perceptible difference in the tone and audiences of the two thinkers of revolutionary views. Krishnamurti speaks in a soft, personal tone. He can be called the elitist way. While Kabir stands in the middle of a street like a proud rustic addressing the masses at the top of his voice.

J. Krishnamurti's approach has no basis in moral injunctions or moral precepts. His inquiry is not into what to do or not to do-or why one does something and not another. Kabir, on the other hand, is undoubtedly a reformer, a conscience-keeper of society. A lone voice amidst the din of orthodoxy, dogmatism and blind faith. Society was only the outer layer, which Kabir wished to reform. He stands out as an odd combination of crudeness and potency. He reveals human feelings unceremoniously and makes vivid the fragmented nature of ordinary life.

Unfortunately, with the passage of time, the followers of Saint Kabir have imprisoned his teachings in creeds, dogmas and sects. And there are all apprehensions that this may also happen to the teachings of J. Krishnamurti. Teachings are not blurred nor rendered lifeless by explorations-they get distorted or vitiated only by interpretation and propagation.

The teachings of these two uncommon individuals, who are so relevant to this age, are so fresh and lively that the posterity may preserve and partake with the freshness and liveliness of these invaluable teachings for the times to come.

To Krishnamurti & Kabir, the Supreme Reality is LIFE. Besides, both equally teach us that the Supreme Reality is not outside us. It is not only in us but we are IT.
Among the causes of our suffering and confusion is the fact, as shown by both the iconoclasts, that we have based our life on traditions which we no longer understand, which we preserve only because they have been handed down to us.

Thus, J. Krishnamurti an eminent non-conformist and spiritual revolutionary of our time, though cannot be compared with any other religious thinker or spiritual saint owing to an original approach based on his very own direct experience, "Likha Likhi Ki Hai Nahin Dekha Dekhi Baat" - Kabir yet in its bare essentials his teaching may be similar or identical with what others have proclaimed before him, like Kabir.

Sant Kabir's approach to Truth and Reality, on a non-sectarian basis, is essentially akin to Krishnamurti as both are in essence the same thing, the same teaching, although using quite different mode of expression.

Both are not teachings in the actual sense of the word but pointers to an immediate human transformation through a total Mutation of the Mind- not a mere change at the periphery, but a transformation at the very center and the content of one's being, which becomes intelligible only in the process of self-discovery, and not through the following of systems, doctrines or practicing asceticism, ritualism or disciplines of any kind.

Like J. Krishnamurti, Sant Kabir was a great revolutionary of his own times who denounced vehemently the absurdity of intellectual jargon, and dependence on scriptures or texts. This testifies of the anti-traditional and un-conventional approach of both of the challenging teachers:— Kabir and Krishnamurti who stated in their own ways that Truth is not understood verbally or theoretically but instead it is lived and that the person who verbally repeats a truth, is stating a lie.

A Kabir's couplet (Doha) speaks thus to testify this fact:
Both Kabir and Krishnamurti, being truly revolutionary in their approach, appear almost iconoclastic and completely unconventional. They both insist that no dogmas or creeds should emerge out of their teachings.

Let us hope that teachings of J. Krishnamurti, the most modern Seer, are not imprisoned in dogmas and creeds, as it seems to have happened in case of Sant Kabir. It is necessary to put his teachings in proper perspective and to see them in the perspective of ancient wisdom and modern thought. This will impart to the teachings vitality and liveliness without which they become lifeless and dead.

As the problem of modern civilization is the problem of right perception, and undoubtedly right action follows the right perception naturally. The problem is fundamentally philosophical, or more truly psychological. It is the problem of perception, which is not a gradual process, spread over time but it is, instead, an instantaneous seeing by the mind. It is the seeing by the mind in a flash that is discussed both by Kabir and Krishnamurti.

For both Kabir and Krishnamurti, who being non-traditional by themselves, come down heaving on all traditional approaches. According to them life, being a whole at any moment, everywhere, and so its perception must have the quality of wholeness in it. The right perception in an instant, therefore, has the capacity to see the truth in a flash, which cleanses the mind of all the past in an instant.

In fact, mind is the one factor referred to throughout the teachings of both of Kabir and Krishnamurti. It is this, which makes their teachings most relevant to the present age. As the mind functions under certain limitations; it is these inherent limitations that are involved in its choice. Obviously the choice is done by the human mind out of its likes and dislikes. Thus choice arises out of confusion and conflict. When the mind is not confused there is no choice. There is direct perception. The choice is made under the stress of conflict of dualities. It is guided not by perception but by projection, out of the memory of past events and experiences.
As Kabir says in one of his couplets:

*Bar Hi Bar Vichar Dekho Man, Ant Kahooon Mat Jaiho*
*Kahai Kabir Sab Chhadi Kalpna Jayoon Ke Tayoon Theharaiho!*

(Mind, where you want to go. There is no path ahead not is there a traveller. I advise you to stand still where you are)

The seeking for the meaning and purpose of life is possible only when the limitations within which the human mind functions are transcended. The human mind sets its limits and wants to find reality within these limits. If it cannot find reality within these frontiers, it comes to the conclusion that it does not exist. Kabir said in one of his popular couplets:

*Kabira Khada Bazar Main, Liya Lukati Haathi*
*Jo Ghar Phoonke Apna, Chale Hamare Saathi!*

(He who is prepared to set fire to his home, let him come with me.)

The home, here is the centre of attachment, whether good and noble. There is really no question of good or bad, for these classifications of choice made by the mind which itself is caught in the dualities of good and bad. After all choice demands accepting or rejecting. And choice exists only when there is confusion. Man has created a civilization where the mind is very clever but where the heart is completely dehydrated or dry. Within its legitimate limits the mind can function with great efficiency but outside those limits it is completely blind, which does not allow it to perceive what exists. To explore is to perceive what is and what comes.

In fact, perception in its true sense is identical with understanding. There is the flash of understanding when the movement of the mind is very still, when the thought is absent and the mind is not burdened with its own noise.

Perception itself is understanding and the true action emerges in the ground of perception. The mind without a movement of its own—that is indeed the ground in which alone action can take place. All else is a mere reaction.

Kabir and Krishnamurti speak of transcending the limits of the mind. That is because love is not born out of activity of the mind. It takes place where all activity...
of the mind has ceased, where the mind is well-established in a state of harmony, neither accepting nor rejecting. Kabir says in one of his familiar couplet thus:

_Paya Kahe So Bawara, Khoya Kahe So Murki_
_Paya Khoya Kachhu Nafin Jo Kuchh So Bharpur!

According to Kabir and Krishnamurti, right perception comes alone in an exploration of this region beyond the mind, which is the ground of true understanding. It is entirely a new dimension, not perceptible to the mind, for it transcends the limits of the mind. This new dimension is arrived at instantly, for it does not belong to time which moves along the axis of the past and the future.

Both Kabir and Krishnamurti are similar and yet different from each other in many respects. They follow their own line of thinking independently. And yet, moving along their respective and independent line of thinking their approaches constantly intersects. Thus, these two teachings are diverse and yet they are similar.

The human problems are mainly psychological, not, physical. As the usual concept of a spiritual life is a change in the pattern of behaviour, it demands tremendous effort involving ceaseless resistance. The so-called spiritual life is full of these resistances because it is considered to be the effort of one’s will. The so-called spiritual man is more self-centred than an ordinary man, for he is more attached to the "I" than perhaps the ordinary man. Every one stays within the limits of the mind, no one has transcended the limits of the mind. Those who have gone beyond the limits of the mind, they alone know the joy of life in its abundance.

J. Krishnamurti says- there is only one virtue and one vice. There is one vice and that is presence of the "I", the self, the ego. Where the self or the ego is not present, that indeed is the virtuous life. A virtuous life is free from all motivation—both good as well as bad. Therefore Sant Kabir says-_"Stand still where you are."_ Any cultivation of virtue involves the effort of the self to continue.

The movement of life can be either the movement of becoming or a movement of being. The highest state is the natural state. It is not a state built by the efforts of the mind. The joys of being are greater than the pleasure of becoming. Kabir says in the concluding line of one of his songs:
(Beyond the dualities of pain and pleasure there is Joy).

Where there is motivation there is no true spirituality. The mind of man must be cleansed of all motives even those that are regarded as spiritual and divine.

It must be the unknown to receive the unknowable. It is this which is the true nature of virtue, the nature of spiritual life!

The only spirituality is the unconditioned Truth, which is Life itself. A spiritual man is one who is innocent enough in rejoicing as the bird in the clear sky, unburdened, independent, ecstatic in freedom. He moves without any resistance, for he carries no weight—neither the weight of the past nor the weight of the future. There is fundamental renewal. It is only the innocent man who can live in a world that is corrupt. Because he is himself, he has stepped out of the stream of life, which corrupts and contaminates everything that it touches. The innocent man is not a part of the world, he is in the world but not of it. It is the innocent man whom the stream of the corrupt world cannot touch. And therefore he alone lives—truly lives. Such a man has to go nowhere in search of truth, for where he is he can experience it—what the English poet William Black Said:

"To see a world in a grain of sand, and heaven in a wild flower,

Hold infinity in the palm of the hand and eternity in an hour."

Truly, the spiritual life is a reversal of consciousness—the regaining of the child-state that one has lost in gathering more and more psychological experiences rooted in principles, ideations and ideals. One associates spiritual life with great amount of resistance and control which exhausts and tries one who strives to lead a spiritual life. But to get back to the transparency and the innocence of child-like state is indeed the purpose of true spiritual life, which demands of discipline through freedom, and not of freedom through discipline.

Thus, both Kabir and Krishnamurti spoke of the arrival of such a human being who acts but never reacts and is, therefore, not the product of discipline and
control-but of freedom. Freedom is its own discipline. Of such freedom were the
great seers—both KABIR AND KRISHNAMURTI!
Krishnamurti’s teachings are similar to the Russian Mystic Gurdjieff’s Esoteric work system as they are in line with the esoteric system of Gurdjieff, Ouspensky, also expressed in somewhat different terms. They are obviously talking about the something i.e; man’s need for real knowledge of himself is the initial step towards real understanding and ability to live properly in a world that does not know what such real living means.

George Jovanovich Gurdjieff, a Russian mystic born in 1873 in Alexandropol, and whose followers included many intellectuals, writers and poets like P. D. Ouspensky, Dr. Nicoll & others.

Now, Gurdjieff and Krishnamurti though vastly dissimilar in origin and outlook, were both motivated by a desire to demonstrate a more fundamental and truer mode of existence than is experienced by modern man.

Both, in their different ways set out to show man that at present he does not know himself and they indicate that the only way by which the self-knowledge is to be found.

As the real change can come from within oneself and one has to discover the missing key—that key was self-knowledge.

Both Krishnamurti and Gurdjieff have thrown light on the subject of the true meaning of existence by revealing an attitude to life and living, which is fundamentally divergent from the commonly accepted outlook.

It is in the writings of Dr. Maurice Nicoll,—the chief disciple of Gurdjieff’s co-worker, Ouspensky,—that we feel lies the bridge which links the work of Gurdjieff with that of J. Krishnamurti, especially in Dr. Nicoll’s “Psychological commentaries on the Teachings of Gurdjieff and Ouspensky.” These commentaries comprising of five volumes, are contained with priceless gems of wisdom which introduce us to a deeper level of living and of understanding within oneself enabling oneself to enter a world which is right outside that in which one lives ordinarily.

Through the commentaries of Dr. Nicoll, and the teachings of Krishnamurti, we feel that those who are seeking sincerely for a more fundamental and truer mode
of existence can find the way thereto, in full accord with the true spiritual foundation of life and of the universe.

Essentially, the works of both Gurdjieff and Krishnamurti set out to show man that at present he does not know himself, and they indicate the only way by which that self-knowledge is to be found.

It is only by obeying the injunction MAN, KNOW THYSELF that the true hidden purpose or significance of life is to be found. The real self-knowledge can transform the life of every man and woman bringing them into direct communion with the more fundamental and deeper dimension of themselves, which they never knew existed. It is rooted in the same creative Essence, which created the external universe in which we live and move and have our being.

According to the Gurdjieff system, what we call ourselves is just an imaginary entity, or an illusion. The purpose of this system is to make people aware that the “I” they always think themselves to be is merely “IMAGINARY I” once one is really aware of this fundamentally important fact, one’s whole attitude to oneself will begin to change.

Gurdjieff’s teachings are based on the premise that we are all abysmally ignorant of ourselves and very different from what we imagine ourselves to be. Strongly influenced by Freud and Edmund Husserl, Gurdjieff believed that all conscious processes are intentional and therefore man’s vision of himself as a passive creature in an active universe is extremely inhibiting and hinders the creative process.

J. Krishnamurti does not approach this particular subject in exactly the same way, although fundamentally he works in the same direction by trying to make us realize the essential falseness and illusoriness of the personality, with its many shifts and changes according to the predominant idea of the moment which dominates that entity which we call, ourselves.

Gurdjieff’s work took the form of inducing in his students long stretches of self-remembering, by means of esoteric that very few were able to follow his teachings or maintain the very rigorous training he expected. Even so, intellectuals like Ouspensky, Kenneth walker and Dr. Maurice Nicoll (who was,
responsible for Gurdjieff's escape from Russia) not only became dedicated disciples, but made his teachings accessible to the general public. Dr. Nicoll was himself a noted psychologist, and studied under Jung in Zurich. He gave up his practice eventually to teach the system he was taught by Gurdjieff and Ouspensky, which is called THE WORK, because he realized that only through that system, which is sometimes termed Esoteric Psychology, could man really transform himself from the unreal being he now is (although not aware of the fact) into the real entity he could become, through consistent work on himself, through the teachings of THE WORK.

The first essential, according to the Esoteric teachings of Gurdjieff, is to change one's attitude to oneself, to regard oneself differently. The teaching about the Imaginary "I" is the first essential to be grasped if one wishes to tread the path of self-awakening, which is the purpose of one's quest into the realms of Esotericism.

Here Gurdjieff presents the three classical ways to bring about spiritual change in a man so that he must leave his present state of non-awareness about himself to become aware of himself, as part of the process of self-knowledge and these are:

i) The way of the fakir,

ii) The way of the yogi, and

iii) The way of the monk

But there is also a fourth way, taught by George Ivanovich Gurdjieff which did not require retirement from the world or total obedience to any guru or teacher. It simply required each aspirant to cultivate the faculty of what he termed self-remembering, i.e. paying attention to the present moment instead of wandering the ephemeral worlds of past and future. Indeed he claimed that there was no past or future; there was only the NOW. And the present is in reality just one long infinite moment to be enjoyed and savoured. To produce this self-remembering, Gurdjieff taught, it is necessary to jolt people out of their habit of brooding incessantly, on their worries, their ills and resentments- with shock treatment by way of hard work, special exercises, Sufi dances, and special forms of meditation so that they were able to experience an inner contraction in which everything is seen with intense clarity.
Gurdjieff, who combined a knowledge of western science with gleanings from the Vedanta, as well as from Taoist, Sufi and Christian sources, claimed that living by self-remembering meant greater biological efficiency, greater longevity, a lowered rate of illness, better sleep and above all, greater creativity. He believed also that man has three centers: the intellectual, the emotional and the moving or physical. When a man is balanced, each centre works in harmony with the others. Thus, self-remembering could lead to a higher state of consciousness in its total harmony.

We can observe well how all the various aspects of work on oneself are linked up in the Gurdjieff system. On the other hand, although not employing the same terms, Krishnamurti worked towards the same end by the methods he talks and writes about. He, too wishes us to be liberated from our false self, through choiceless and constant awareness so that what is real can take possession of our lives.

In the teachings of J. Krishnamurti, the process of self-observation, without choice, is called watching, a passive self-awareness. It is the only method whereby one may become really conscious of oneself in one's everyday thoughts, feelings and actions, and no system which does not employ it can be called really esoteric. The Esoteric psychology, as distinct from ordinary psychology, can, thus, help in the task of self-knowing as propounded by Gurdjieff and Krishnamurti. As through the whole teaching of the Gurdjieff system constant emphasis is laid on the need of self-Remember, or remember ourselves. The idea behind self-remembering, therefore, is to try to install within oneself a conscious awareness of the existence of something far greater and nobler than the everyday personal self. It has a profound esoteric significance.

Gurdjieff is one who has thrown light on the subject of the true meaning of existence, and there is another one J. Krishnamurti who has tended to turn men's minds in the same direction-although from a somewhat different angle. The Talks and writings of J. Krishnamurti reveal an attitude to life quite divergent from the commonly accepted outlook. When one reads or listens to what he has to say, one has the feeling of entering an entirely different world of thought and meaning, utterly foreign to that in which one is living.
In its essentials, the teachings of Krishnamurti are in line with the esoteric system put forward by Gurdjieff, although expressed in somewhat different terms. Basically, they are talking about the same thing, i.e. man's need for real knowledge of himself as the initial step towards real understanding and ability to live properly in a world that does not know what such real living means.

Thus, as self-knowledge increases and deepens, so one's wisdom and understanding about life in general increases & deepens.

To quote Krishnamurti from a talk: "......Self-knowledge is the beginning of wisdom. Self-knowledge is not according to some psychologist's book or philosopher, but to know oneself as one is from moment to moment. To know oneself is to observe what one thinks, how one feels, not just superficially, but to be deeply aware of what is? Without condemnation, without Judgement, without evaluation or comparison. Unless this takes place, not only at the superficial level, but right through the whole content of consciousness, there can be no delving into the profoundity of the mind... It is THIS that we are concerned with and NOTHING ELSE. The mind is conditioned right through, there is no part of the mind which is not conditioned and our problem is, can such a mind free itself?"

As we have found that some of the great teachings of Gurdjieff are essentially the same as those found in J. Krishnamurti but it must not remain unnoticed in our present study that the contrast between the two remarkable men is no less evident. J. Krishnamurti does not believe in admitting disciples or in founding 'Institutes For the Harmonious Development of Man' as was the case with Gurdjieff who demanded and received absolute obedience from everyone of his pupils. Gurdjieff, much unlike J. Krishnamurti, regarded himself as a preacher/Master whose word was law, and he reigned as a tyrant among devoted slaves.

[Ref: Louis Pauwel's Gurdjieff P. 146]

Gurdjieff, being interested in mysticism, occult Science and esoteric psychology is said to have brought his ideas back with him from long journeys in the interior of Asia where he studied in mysterious monasteries, Mongolian and Tibetan, and other secret places of Sufi mysticism and Tantric traditions of the East. He believed that the work of harmonization should not be undertaken otherwise than under the care of a teacher who has learned in the occult Schools of the East to
diagnose and set straight the individual shortcomings of each human machine that presents itself to him. He claimed to have acquired his knowledge from remarkable men, from a group of priests, scientists, tantrics and esoterist/scholars who had set themselves the task of scouring the world in search of knowledge hidden away in more or less inaccessible monasteries, in secret schools, in songs and dances, a knowledge whose key could only be obtained through various initiatory trials. But J. Krishnamurti was so radical from the very outset of his awakened life (from 1928 onward) that he denied to himself all authority. And he said so precisely: "...Anyone who wants to find the truth has to learn to think and discover for himself and not accept descriptions, definitions, other peoples words."

His was a life, which at no moment showed any thought of something being important and others not—a feeling that some are low and others high. He said in his earlier days: -

"I desired to learn from the gardener, from the pariah (untouchable), from my neighbour, from my friend, from everything, that could teach, in order to become one with the Beloved."

To the end, he listened carefully, with attention and with affection to everyone, without distinction of high or low.

Watching and listening to the scientist, the intellectual, the politician, everybody, Krishnamurti saw into the core of things as a reading of his "commentaries on living" and other writings makes clear.

Many of those who listened to J. Krishnmurti over the years felt the extraordinary power and upliftment, which came through him in his talks, discussions and personal conversation. But bewareing the people prone to have influence and to use it, he frequently warned, "Do not be influenced by me."

So right from the beginning, when he began his work, Krishnmurti made it clear that he was not trying to convince or persuade anybody. All that he did was to try to awaken perception and the desire to seek out the truth by understanding truly through one's own listening, learning and observing without holding on to authority, repeating statements or quoting books—even his own. When there is real desire to seek for the truth, then each person becomes free, then there is a steady light and that is what each one has to find.
But says Krishnamurti: “Man cannot come to it through any organization, through any creed, through any priest or ritual, not through any philosophical knowledge or psychological technique. He has to find it through the mirror of relationship, through the understanding of the contents of his own mind, through observation and not through intellectual analysis or introspective dissection....Man’s perception of life is shaped by the concepts already established in his mind. The content of his consciousness is his entire existence. This content is common to all humanity.... The uniqueness of man lies in complete freedom from the content of his consciousness.” Which is common to all mankind.

“Freedom is not a reaction; freedom is not choice. Freedom is pure observation without direction, without motive. Freedom is not at the end of the evolution of man but lies in the first step of his existence....Thought is time. Time is the psychological enemy of man. Thought is born of experience and knowledge, which are inseparable from time and the past. So man is always a slave to the past and so man lives in constant struggle and conflict. There is no psychological evolution. In pure observation without division, there is insight without any shadow of the past or of time. This timeless insight brings about a deep radical mutation in the mind.”

[Excerpts from the statement written by Krishnamurti himself in Oct., 1980.]

As hinted out earlier in the beginning of our present study, let us elaborate further that George Gurdjieff an occultist was the Russian mystic with a Sufi background, who wandered for twelve long years in central Asia for search of truth, evolved himself by his attaining a higher level of consciousness and derived much of his teaching from sources of Sufism and Eastern Esotericism.

Occultism at its highest and widest is a study and handling of the subtler energies of the universe according to the plan of cosmic evolution.

The occultist achieves through modifications in his consciousness an increased awareness of and participation in the universal life around him.

In occultism an ounce of practice is worth a pound of theory.

Gurdjieff described three stages in the process of freeing a man from useless parts of himself in his inward journey from Personality to the Essence. The first stage in his liberation was that he should see himself as he actually was, the second that he
should realize his nothingness, and the third that he should be willing to die, and thus allow of his being reborn.

According to Gurdjieff’s system it is only that part of a man’s personality which is purely imaginary and therefore incompatible with man’s development, that has to be sacrificed only then will it be possible for him to attain a higher level of being, and at the same time gain a greater degree of understanding. The development of Essence depended mainly on a man’s own, inner work on himself. A man’s real ‘I’ can only grow from a man’s Essence.

Gurdjieff’s experiments revealed the fact that the only hope for the world was that man should eventually reach a higher level of being, in other words that he should wake more out of his sleep. For any progress to be made in the harmonious development of man, he must advance simultaneously along the two lines of “Knowledge” and “being”. At present his knowledge was advancing much more rapidly than his “being”. This meant that he had very little real understanding of what he knew.

Indeed, Gurdjieff had once remarked, to his Moscow group, that the last thing that a man was willing to give up was his identification with his own suffering!

One of Gurdjieff’s favourite sayings was the statement that “Work began with a realization of one’s own nothingness.”

George Gurdjieff brought back from his Asiatic travels three different entities: a certain system of ideas; music and a number of special movements and dances of a highly complicated nature. He had also taken to America, a troop of followers well trained in the movements and the dances.

As a passing reference to the fact, the Acharya Rajneesh later called Bhagwan Osho Rajneesh, another modern mystic of recent past had reintroduced and readily adopted many of the Gurdjieff Sufi dances and movements of meditations for his Ashramites in Poona Ashram founded by him in seventies and are continued even now.

So this was Gurdjieff, the unusual man who in his youth had abandoned his home and had disappeared, with a group of chosen companions, into the wilds of central Asia for more than a decade, in search of truth.
From Gurdjieff as much as from J. Krishnmurti, came knowledge or wisdom, which was not to be found in books and a glimpse of the men with an immense compassion for all mankind.

Both of these most remarkable men had the simplicity of truly great men and for them, very young people were of far greater importance than the rest, for those were representatives of a future generation of men and women, a generation which had not yet been ruined and which, by right education and upbringing might possibly be saved.

The hope of mankind does not lie in the action of any corporate body, howsoever powerful, but in the influence of individual men who for the sake of a greater have sacrificed a lesser aim!
'f'- (iv): *The Two Modern Mystics – J. Krishnamurti & Osho Rajneesh.*

Rajneesh Chandra Mohan was born in a businessman family at Kuchwada (M. P.), on December 11, 1931. On obtaining his Master’s Degree in 1957, taught philosophy at Raniipur college from 1957 to 1966 which he quitted to become a wandering philosopher and one of the greatest rebellious thinkers of 20th Century India.

In the opinion of one of the renowned contemporary writers Khushwant Singh:

“For whatever it is worth Osho Rajneesh was the most original thinker that India has produced; the most erudite, the most clear-headed and the most innovative. And in addition he had an inborn gift of words, spoken and written.”

As an iconoclast and an unusual teacher of our times, Osho Rajneesh aimed at bringing home to man the importance of standing up on one’s own feet, and not walking through life on the rules framed by others. He would have one cultivate inner harmony to find truth at first hand within oneself and to let one feel that each man is, in very truth, his own god, his own teacher, his own prophet.

As a genuine philosophical figure and mystic, Osho Rajneesh views are in various degrees paralleled also by the writings of other sages & philosophers, such as Maharshi Raman, J. Krishnamurti, George Ivanovitch Gurdjieff, P. D. Ouspensky and Fredrich Nietzsche than to any of the Indian philosophers with whose writings he is thoroughly familiar.

Osho Rajneesh, indeed, mounts a concerted attack on traditional religious assumptions, while insisting in particular on ‘a special transmission outside the scriptures.’

He cares more to arouse thought than to convey it.

In one of his utterances, Osho Rajneesh speaks about his teachings as underlined below as to be its quintessence:

“*My message is not a doctrine, not a philosophy. My message is a certain alchemy, a Science of transformation, so only those who are willing to die as they are and be born again into something so new that they cannot even imagine it right now.... only those few*
courageous people will be ready to listen, because listening is going to be risky. Listening, you have taken the first step towards being reborn. So it is not a philosophy that you can just make an overcoat of and go bragging about. It is not a doctrine where you can find consolation for harassing questions.

......No, my message is not some verbal communication. It is far more risky. It is nothing less than death and rebirth.”

Now for the purpose of our present thesis, one of Rajneesh’s teaching are found to be essentially the same as those found in J. Krishnamurti, an unconventional thinker under our study herein.

For both Krishnamurti and Osho Rajneesh, words, Scriptures, cults and dogmas are meant to keep the soul of man fettered to the seashore and deny it the freedom necessary for all explorations. There is nothing greater and grander than freedom-one’s native freedom of his consciousness and that whosoever is opposed to the freedom of man’s soul is his enemy. Political and economic slavery is bad, of course, but that which fetters the individual’s conscience is really worse.

Both are aware of the absence of unity in man and remind us of our illusion in regard to our ‘I’. While advocating freedom from religious dogmas and superstitious faith in rituals, they presented truth in the most direct and simple way as if it comes from ‘direct spiritual perception.’

It is interesting to note too, for all their differences, that Krishnamurti and Osho Rajneesh want us to understand the total process of ourselves and emphasize the importance of self-knowledge in their speeches and writings. They develop a philosophy of self-study and self-observation. The idea of self-study thus acquires in their eyes a new meaning.

J. Krishnamurti and Osho Rajneesh refuse to endorse the age-long view that the true faith of men is revealed in their fear of God and that religious training should discourage questioning and doubt. What they both set out to do was to cut themselves free from old associations and to convince their contemporaries that they have no disciple and do not intend to have disciples. They hold that Truth is dynamic and is constantly being revealed and renewed. It is an eternal presence, which escapes all our concepts of duration, time and place. This is the reason why all
the great spiritual teachers have been-and should be-dynamic, non-conformists and non-traditionalists.

Both of them—Krishnamurti and Rajneesh have freed themselves from the tyranny of texts and have risked all popularity by their outspoken frankness and uncompromising integrity.

They can never be our refuge, and our authority, though each is a lamp and a refuge unto himself. And though they are revolutionary, they do not make revolution a system or their teachings an organized faith.

Rajneesh's chief pronouncements concerning the right kind of education are essentially similar to those of J. Krishnamurti and have been presented in "Towards the Birth of the New Man," one of his most brilliant and lively addresses, in 'Random Thoughts', a collection of his important instructions, and in the numerous volumes of 'Jyoti-Shikha', a quarterly published in Bombay to disseminate his views.

Here lies the crux of what these original thinkers stood for as profound exponent of the ancient teaching of the Upanishads, which speaks thus: 'Education is that which liberates.'

They both thus find with deep-rooted and widespread abnormal methods of education of the rising generation and suggest that the pupils should not be filled with ambition and useless information whereby every increase in scientific knowledge brings the destruction and degeneration of civilization nearer.

Modern education with its emphasis on nationalism, ambition, competition, etc. can hardly contribute to world peace and the facts merely demonstrate the utter uselessness of our educational system and institutions.

Both Krishnamurti and Osho Rajneesh call for a change in the methods of education and insist that a specially Corresponding correct education is indispensable, rightly demanding removal of restrictions to natural and spontaneous development of the pupils.

But of the drawbacks of modern education which deprives us of our inner peace and unity, no one has spoken with more eloquent lucidity than
J. Krishnamurti with whose speeches and works Osho Rajneesh is obviously quite familiar.

For Krishnamurti, education that trains us to seek personal gain and security, to fight for ourselves, and to be efficient without cultivating an integrated outlook on life is certainly deplorable.

In his remarkable book an education entitled: 'Education & the Significance of Life', Krishnamurti lays emphasis as a core of his view on right kind of education thus: "To understand life is to understand ourselves and that is both the beginning and the end of education."

Thus education in the true sense as propounded by both J. Krishnamurti and Osho Rajneesh, is the understanding of oneself, for it is within each of us that the whole of existence is gathered. Thus, both plead for an integrated comprehension of life, for freedom, and for the awakening of intelligence in the child, while deprecating all conformity & tradition as well as all organized faiths and systems of ideas.

Apart from this, Rajneesh's message in a majority of his discourses is permeated through and through with ideas that remind one of Krishnamurti. His words for many are but a modern Hindi adaptation of Krishnamurti’s teaching.

It is not only in questioning the main principles of organized religions that Krishnamurti and Rajneesh have rendered service to their generation but when we turn to consider some other details of their teaching it is obvious that all that can be represented here are the main ideas which they are in general agreement. To begin with, they insist that most of us have fear in one form or another and that where there is fear there is neither freedom nor intelligence. They agree that life is really very beautiful and that we can appreciate its extraordinary richness and loveliness only when we learn to discover, to revolt, and not to conform and imitate. We must be free to question, to find out for ourselves what God is, to live without fear and without having to fit into the framework of some rotten system of society.

Krishnamurti and Rajneesh do not think there would be chaos in the world if all individuals were in revolt. Is not the present society already in chaos? Is everyone living fully, richly, happily? Obviously the world is in a process of decay and
humanity as a whole is faced with challenge. If one responds to this challenge as a Hindu or a Buddhist, a Christian or a communist, then one's response is very limited—which, adds Krishnamurti, is no response at all. Rajneesh's demand for the death of religions is not very different from Krishnamurti's demand for "Complete freedom to grow and create a different society, a new world. You can respond fully, adequately", Krishnamurti adds, only if there is no fear in you, only if you don't think as Hindu, a communist or a capitalist, but as a total human being who is trying to solve this problem; and you cannot solve it unless you yourself are in revolt against the whole thing, against the ambitious acquisitiveness on which society is based.

[Ref: This Matter of Culture P. 13]

Osho Rajneesh, too, recognizes the need for responding to all human problems as one alive to them with his whole being and as one inwardly, deeply, psychologically in constant revolt what prevents one from responding to life as a total human being is the fact that each man belongs to a group which claims to possess truth to the exclusion of all other groups, giving rise to endless chaos. Each organized religion, each group, or society assumes that it alone is right, and hence we have disaster.

To J. Krishnamurti, nothing is more characteristic than his insistence on the need for free thinking, discontent and revolt. Revolt, according to him, is of two kinds: there is violent revolt born of reaction against the existing order, and there is the deep psychological revolt of intelligence. Revolts that are real come with self-knowledge; and are not the result of reaction, without understanding.

Here Krishnamurti holds firmly to the belief that "the ignorant is not the unlearned, but he who does not know himself." The learned man, for him is stupid when he relies on books, on knowledge and on authority to give him understanding. "Real understanding, he points out, "comes only through self-knowledge which is awareness of one's total psychological process."

[Ref: Education and the Significance of Life, P. 17]

The greatest stress is laid by both on human freedom and on going within to find the truth—that we should commune with our own hearts. To see ourselves
precisely as we are, is for them, the truth. They want us to deepen our experience of life by turning our attention inwards and exploring the sources of our own beings.

Now, there are certain contrasting views between Rajneesh and Krishnamurti, which should also not evade our attention in our present study.

Krishnamurti never fails to remind us that he is not giving a method, a remedy or a readymade formula. But on the other hand Osho Rajneesh preached and practiced many a Dhyan Sadhnas or techniques of meditation for making the mind still such as Dynamic Meditation or Nadbraham, Gibbrish and many others, which are being. Observed even this day in the Puna Ashram founded by him even in his lifetime and after his death that occurred on 19 Jan 1990. But according to J. Krishnamurti, unlike Osho Rajneesh, a general formula or technique cannot deal with life, because in life every moment is fresh and unprecedented. Treating life according to a pattern, with an end in view is exactly the wrong use of the mind and the cause of restlessness, inimical to the spontaneous and detached clarity of the silent mind.

Such a mind-quiet and tranquil mind, however, cannot be induced by meditation, practice, control, or discipline.

In one another important respect at least, the contrast between Osho Rajneesh and J. Krishnamurti is admittedly tremendous. While the former was a profound scholar, a Voracious reader, and a philosopher, the latter has repeatedly declared "he has not read any books on psychology or any religious book fortunately."

[Ref: The First and Last Freedom P. 19]

Elsewhere Krishnamurti has said: "Tell them that I have read nothing, that I have no authorities. For me there can be no psychological mutation until the process of accumulating knowledge ceases."

[Interview with Krishnamurti by Carlo Suares]

It is impossible to say how far Rajneesh’s teaching is actually the outcome of his own illumination, and how far it is the expression of the influence of J. Krishnamurti and others. Both factors seem to be certainly involved.

Osho Rajneesh many a times has shown his admiration for J. Krishnamurti whom he resembled with 20th. Century Buddha-as the latest edition of Buddha yet,
having such an adoration and despite considering Krishnamurti an enlightened man, Osho Rajneesh has expressed his critical appreciation in an open address giving a dissenting view of Krishnamurti whom he lauded and differed with simultaneously as is testified from the following version of Osho Rajneesh’s discourse:

“I want you to understand: enlightenment is so light, so loving, so peaceful—just like a laughter. The theologians have made it so heavy, so burdensome, that people ignore it. Enlightenment should also be entertainment at the same time.

It reminds me of J. Krishnamurti’s last sentence before he died, (d. 17th Feb. 1986) just a few months ago. He was a very serious person, and that was his only fault. He was enlightened, but he took enlightenment as a serious matter. He saw that he was enlightened and nobody else was enlightened. And he was trying hard to make people enlightened.... obviously.

For seventy years—he died at the age of ninety—for seventy years, from the age of twenty, he had been working on people, and not a single person had become enlightened. You can understand his sense of deep failure and his sadness..... becoming more serious, almost a sickness.

And the reason is clear from his last statement “people don’t take enlightenment seriously, they think it is entertainment.” And that is where I differ. Enlightenment cannot be anything else other than entertainment...... universal entertainment, a laughter that knows no bounds, no limits, You laugh, and the trees laugh, and the cuckoos laugh, and the clouds laugh, and the stars laugh, and the laughter goes on spreading because everybody is triggering everybody else. You need not actually trigger, just your laughter will be enough for somebody else to start laughing.

I love J. Krishnamurti, and I love his hard effort of seventy years continuously, but I am absolutely against his attitude. He was making it a serious affair. That was the fault of all the old prophets. That’s why you will not find a statue of Mahavira laughing. What a miserable world, you don’t allow even Mahavira to laugh. You will not find a statue of Gautama Buddha laughing. Even if Gautama Buddha laughed, people would not believe their eyes or ears: “what is happening? Such a serious man....?”

But you don’t understand that when the mind is gone you are just like a small child. Laughter will arise without any effort on your part. At least I am a break from the whole past,
and in the future I want my people to be laughing Buddhas. Serious ones we have seen enough of, they have not been able to transform humanity. Let us try another direction of non-seriousness:

One call invites one hundred comrades .... one Buddha—just his presence—magnetically pulls a thousand Buddhas, ten thousand Buddhas. It is a question of how great your enlightenment is, how great your compassion and love is, and how nonseriously you have taken it. Nobody likes a serious person.

Have you ever thought about it, that all the saints are serious? It is perfectly good to go and touch their feet..... and be finished. Nobody wants their company. These people will be going to heaven-remember it. Heaven is overcrowded with saints. If you want the right kind of people to go to the other place, where you will find poets, and you will find painters, and you will find dancers and musicians.

I am going particularly to the other place. So remembers, whoever is with me will have a great journey and a meeting with great people. No saint has been of any value—no creativity, no poetry, no painting. All those people who were creators, who have made this world a little beautiful, a little more livable, are gathered in the other place.

Fredrich Nitzsche said God is dead, but he did not say why he is dead. He has to be dead, surrounded by all these idiots, eternally stinking.... because most of them don’t take a bath, don’t wash their mouths. Laughter is absolutely unknown in paradise, poor God could not survive.

So I warn you, beware! If by chance you reach to the gates of heaven-refuse. Don’t enter in. Ask for the way to the other place. I will be waiting there for you. Ask for me and that will do.

CRY
AFTER CRY
AFTER CRY OF JOY----
NOT MINDING
THE HAIR
TURNING WHITE.

This Zen poet is saying that even crying is so beautiful, so lightening, so unburdening.
Don’t be worried about time.... space....age. Just learn to laugh and cry totally, because these are the simplest ways to reach your innermost being.

You are blessed to have a master who is not a burden on you. You are blessed to have a master who is not a masochist, a sadist.

I am not so blessed. I had never come across a single man whom I could have called my master. I had to work my way alone, on my own, going this way and that; falling and getting up again, nobody to guide me, nobody to give me any instruction, nobody even to indicate a finger to the moon. But it seems, just by chance, I happened to stumble upon the right place.

I am a master who had no master. So I cannot see and cannot say what you see in my eyes, in my face. But whatever you are seeing is really a pure reflection of your love and your trust. The body will wither away, but I have another body, of light. Before this body withers away, you have to become acquainted with my light body, with my inner center. And your center and my inner center are not two. In that area there is always one- neither two nor three.

....Your mind cannot understand laughter. Laughter is very illogical. A logical person cannot laugh; a logical person is confined to a very small area.

I have not heard that Kant ever laughed. He could not; he was too serious a person.

Just now I was talking to you about J. Krishnamurti

......He used to come to India at least once or twice a year. He went to only three places: Varanasi, New Delhi, and Bombay. I had instructed all my Sannyasins, “Wherever he is, either in India, just sit in the front line wherever he is speaking. And don’t forget the orange and the mala.”

And that was enough. Then he would not speak on any other subject. That was enough to make him so angry, “I have been telling my whole life.....!” And my people enjoyed it, they loved it. Even a few people who were not Sannyasins used to go in orange, borrowing a mala from a friend.

Just a single Sannyasin was enough. Then he would forget everything that he was going to say. Then he just had to condemn me, condemn Sannyas, and condemn everything- not understanding, that he was being easily distracted. What does it matter? Somebody is wearing orange and having a mala..... it is none of his business.
But he was a serious man. He would hit his own head. He would become so angry... particularly in Bombay, because I was in Bombay. So hundreds of Sannyasins would be sitting in the front, and he would hit his head. I am so lazy that I cannot even hit my own head, let alone anybody else's... "Osho"

Osho Rajneesh also acclaimed by his devotees as Bhagwan Rajneesh, a highly controversial character and an enigmatic legend of our era set out on his solo journey of life into an uncharted sea imbued with an intense investigation into the truth about life. The intensity of his spiritual search took him to the bewilderment that touched the highest peak of human consciousness.

Osho Rajneesh like that of J. Krishnamurti had no philosophy of his own to propound or no new religion to profess before the people, but his presence and personal charm has had a spell over his audience of different shades, touching the hearts of millions. He set out on the world tour as a study in human rights in the outset of 1986 till his return to Poona Ashram (founded by him in 1974 for dissemination and intensification of his teaching) back in January, 1987 where he lived for the major part of the seventies and now sleeps over in the samadhi there since January, 1990 with the Epitaph inscribed on it:

"Osho: Never born, never died. Only visited the planet Earth between December 11, 1931 and January 19, 1990."

Osho’s final Message was: "Never speak of me in the past tense. My presence will be ever greater without the burden of my tortured body" - OSHO

His approach is that life should remain insecure. Tomorrow is uncertain:

"While you are together love each other as much as you can. Tomorrow is uncertain. Remain open, but remain perfectly aware of the inner sense of direction. Then many things will fall in with you, and you will not be disturbed. You will be able to use all the opportunities available to help your inner direction. And the inner direction will become the more clear, integrated."

Now, his clarion call encompassing all the great religious traditions of the world and transcending them all the same thus:

"I am trying to bring together all the fragrances released in different countries by differing flowerings of human consciousness. Lao TZU is a flower, so is Buddha, so is
Jesus, so is Mohammed, but now we have to melt all their fragrances into one—a universal fragrance. Then, for the first time, man will be able to be religious and yet undivided.... everything is yours. You become vast.”

[TAO: The Pathless Path Vol:I]

Osho Rajneesh who shared the fragrance of love and life himself first and then ventured to share it with millions of men and women, eastern and western alike for more than four decades of his stay on this planet earth before leaving for eternal abode in harness:

Osho Bhagwan Rajneesh thus spake on the demise of J. Krishnamurti on Feb.1986 in Hindi as follows:

“It is better to die for truth than to live without truth!”
युग का खबरें आई हैं, जहाँ कोई पहला भी नहीं । उनकी उग्र नब्बे वर्ष की थी, और सतर साल तक धूम-धूपकर उन्होंने लोगों के उपरकाम किया है कि किसी तरह लोग मुक्त हो सकें, और इस आदमी को किसी ने अद्व्युषित तक नहीं दी ।

'युग के उनकी मृत्यु का कोई दुख नहीं है, लेकिन मैं पूरे संसार के लिए दुखी हूँ । यह संसार अपने सबसे चमकने सितारों को यूँ ही मुलाए चला जाता है ।

'लेकिन कृष्णमूर्ति केवल लोगों के दिमाग में तक पहुंच पाए, उनके दिलों को नहीं छू पाए । कृष्णमूर्ति के साथ मेरे संबंध को तुम ऐसे देख सकते हो कि उन्होंने मेरे लिए जमीन तैयार की है । उन्होंने बैठिक रूप से लोगों को मेरे लिए तैयार किया है । अब यह मेरा काम है कि मैं लोगों को बुद्धि से इदल की ओर, गहरा ले जाऊँ । हमारा काम एक ही है ।

कृष्णमूर्ति चले गए, लेकिन जब तक मैं नहीं जाता तब तक उनका काम समाप्त नहीं होगा । उनका काम चलता रहेगा ।'
On 9 July 1967 in Saunnen, Switzerland, on his forty-ninth birthday, U. G. Krishnamurti, a well-known in spiritual circles as an anomalous, enigmatic, and iconoclastic figure, died and was brought back to life. What brought about this death and what brought him back to life? U. G. Krishnamurti says 'I don't know. I can't say anything about that because the experience was finished. There was nobody to experience that death at all.'

To U. G. Krishnamurti, it was a completely physical and not a psychological death. He has been living in this state since the experience (he calls the “calamity”) happened to him in Switzerland on his 49th birthday. About that truth, which many 'spiritual seekers' and gurus call 'enlightenment' U. G. Krishnamurti calls it the 'natural state' and maintains that 'So-called enlightenment a purely biological phenomenon, that only when one is completely free of culture, conditioning, religious thinking and intellect, can the body, with its own extraordinary intelligence, free the human being to be in the natural state.

Here perhaps for the first time is a man who speaks with authority on the subject while talking on enlightenment as a neurobiological state of being which is utterly free of religious, psychological or mystical implications. This represents a wholly new and genuinely new approach to the experience, which has tremendous significance to those searching for pseudo truths or So-called enlightenment.

As U. G. Krishnamurti says in his book 'Mind is a Myth':

'It occurred to me that I have searched everywhere to find an answer to my question. 'Is there enlightenment?' but have never questioned the search itself. Because I have assumed that goal, enlightenment exists, I have had to search, and it is the search itself which has been choking me and keeping me out of my natural state. There is no such thing as spiritual or psychological enlightenment because there is no such thing as spirit or psyche at all. I have been a damn fool all my life, searching for something, which does not exist. My search is at an end.'
“We are not really interested in getting rid of our problems,” says U.G. Krishnamurti to no one in particular. A group of his admirers sits quietly by his side. “Because by getting rid of our problem we will also lose ourselves as we know and experience it.”

U. G. Krishnamurti does not give lectures or write books unlike his namesake-J. Krishnamurti. Instead, his conversations are informal and take place wherever he happens to be.

Furthermore, U. G. Krishnamurti emphatically says, “If you are searching for someone who will enlighten you, you have come to a wrong man.”

U. G.’s ruthlessness flows from an incredible honesty but, often, resulted in his being misunderstood. He constantly points out that he is as naked and defenceless as anyone else. “What I have to say is of extraordinary importance to me. I am not interested in winning anyone over to my point of view. Nor is there a chance of anyone, winning me over to theirs.” says U. G. Krishnamurti.

The body as a living organism that is interested solely in survival and the mind as an entity that has no questions, no answers, nothing, are two of U.G.’s central truths. When he discovered them, he had spent exactly 49 years of his life in pursuit of conventional goals like domestic bliss, a rewarding career and ‘enlightenment’.

Born in the orthodox Brahmin background (in1918) with a silver spoon in his mouth, U. G. Krishnamurti inherited 1,20,000 dollars from his grandparents in the forties at a time when the dollar was about three and a half rupees. Later, he married a beautiful Brahmin girl giving birth to four children, earned fame as a lecturer for the Theosophical Society.

In 1955, U.G. and his wife and four children moved to the United States. “Most people go to America to earn money, I went there to spend it” reminds U.G. They went in search of treatment for his eldest son’s polio. Six years later, the money was finished. And, as he says in his book ‘The Mystique of Enlightenment’ (which he later called The Mistake of Enlightenment.) he felt beginning within him a tremendous upheaval, which he could not and did not wish to control. His marriage broke up; he put his family on a plane to India and went on penniless to London.
All through, he had searched for that elusive state called enlightenment. Living virtually on the streets of London and Paris, the search didn’t stop. His wanderings took him to Zurich where he met a kindly old woman called Valentine de Kerven who allowed him to stay in her chalet in the Swiss village of Saanen. It just happened. A state of being expressed itself as a law of life. Indeed, U.G. refers to it as the "calamity", as "an atomic explosion."

When it occurred to U.G. Krishnamurti suddenly, he became truly free. It was a freedom that came from the definite knowledge that there is no self to discover, there is nothing to be transformed, there is no identity constantly demanding its continuity. There is only the body and memory, which is stored in the neurons. The individual uses memory to maintain his non-existing identity. There is no thought, only response to stimuli. The use of such thought to achieve goals produces thinking—and all the ills we see around.

"Whether it is an American, German, Italian or Indian, the only thing everyone wants is happiness without one moment of unhappiness," points out U.G. Everybody wants permanent pleasure without pain. And yet the neurological system can’t take it. When your goals and needs are the same, it all becomes very simple. Then you have enough energy to devote to living problems."

This mismatch between goals and needs, according to U.G., is one of human kind’s biggest failures.

Now, J. Krishnamurti and his contemporary U.G. Krishnamurti though having shared a common patronage of Theosophical Society adopted a different rationale to the exigency of life. While U.G. has always regarded the subject of J. Krishnamurti with extreme distaste and hostility still he had a reverent affection for J. Krishnamurti whom still he considered a beautiful human being who played an important role in the evolution of U.G.’s thinking. Still on certain occasions U.G. Krishnamurti’s onslaught on the teachings of J. Krishnamurti shows that U.G! is obsessed with J. K.

U.G. Krishnamurti was in close contact with J. Krishnamurti for several years and listened to him every time he came to Madras which he did every year from 1947 to 1953. But, perhaps, in keeping with the great tradition of India where the
disciple annihilates the teachings of his mentor, U.G. Krishnamurti openly denied the impact of J. Krishnamurti's teaching on him when expressed such views in answering a question put by his biographer and associate: Mahesh Bhat in these words, "For you his (J. K. 's) teachings may be full of truth and beauty but these teachings failed to touch my 'soul'. The novel ideas and the mind that conceived them never interested me. Although I have never been impressed by the Victorian manners and morals, what attracted me to him that time was his gracious attitude towards everyone. He was devoid of hypocrisy and pretence. I still consider him a beautiful human being."

In reply to another question asking U.G.'s views on J. Krishnamurti's contribution to mankind as a man and his message, U.G. Krishnamurti is reported to have said:

"Because of the seductive pull of his teaching, he may seem more attractive and convincing than others in the market. It is not for me to say what his rightful place is in the world of religious thought. If the historians of human thought want to place him alongside of Buddha, Jesus and Mohammed, it is their affair. But you can be sure that in the world of today the chance of such people blossoming forth are slim or none. The thirty-five leaders that are ruling the world today are the ones that will shape the minds of human beings. Unfortunately the leaders of religious movements that we have in our midst today either have become pawns in the game of power politics or have remained and will remain as ineffective movements in shaping and moulding the destiny of man."

Still on enquiring about any part played by J. Krishnamurti in the evolution of U.G.'s thinking, U.G. Krishnamurti confessed in these words:

"He no doubt played an important role in the evolution of my thinking."

On his contact with J. Krishnamurti, U.G. retorted back thus:

"I didn't live with him (J. K.) for several years as is believed by some. At that time, there was nothing to associate or affiliate oneself closely with him. Now of course that man has a far-flung empire with foundations, schools, and real estate running into millions of dollars-paradox indeed for a man who denounced organization of every hue and colour."

"....He no doubt dissolved the organization built around him as the would-be-messiah of the Theosophists; nevertheless the gnawing question whether he was what
he claimed to be remained with me. For all I know, a sort of delusional separation from the messiah-hood mission may have occurred in him. But did he actually free himself from the mission set for him? His delusional concepts projected as truth and the illusion of experiencing something that is not there falsified his teaching. That filled me with an eerie feeling that something was wrong with him. I found him to be more neurotic than those who went to listen to him. You can psychoanalyse him everlastingly. What is the point?

"When once you have placed your confidence in the teacher and believe him to be in possession of it .... my whole interest in him hung on that single thread. When once I perceived the limitations and illusions of his teachings, I said to myself: this is the end of the road. He is just a hesitant guru who will unfortunately leave behind a 'no-guru-is-necessary cult'. That is all there is to it."

On December 13, 1953, in the city of Madras, none other than U.G put a question to J. Krishnamurti during one of his talks:

Sir, what kick exactly do you get out of these talks and discussions? Obviously you would not go on for more than 20 years, if you do not enjoy them or, is it only force of habit?

Answered J. Krishnamurti: This is a natural question to put, is it not? Because, the questioner only knows or is aware that generally a speaker gets a kick out of it, some kind of personal benefit. Or is it merely old age? Or, whether one is young or old, is it the habit? That is all he is accustomed to: So he puts the question.

What is the truth of this? Am I speaking out of habit? What do you mean by habit, force of habit? Because I have talked for 20 years, am I going to talk for 20 more years till I die? Is the understanding of anything habitual? The use of the words is habitual: but the contents of the words vary according to the perception of truth from moment to moment. If a speaker gets a kick out of it, then he is exploiting you. That is what most of us are used to. The speaker is then using you as a means of fulfillment, and surely it would destroy that which is real. As we are concerned to find the truth and what is from moment to moment, in it there can be no continuity: all habit, all certainly, all desire for fulfillment, all personal aggrandizement must have come to an end, must it not? Otherwise, it is another way of exploiting, another way of deluding people: and with that surely we are not concerned.
This resulted in a meeting of these two unique personalities which led to daily encounters for thirty days and later again for ten days in 1954.

Here are a few excerpts of a letter of June 24, 1967 from Switzerland which, was written by U.G. Krishnamurti to Professor TMP Mahadevan, head of the Philosophy Department, university of Madras, asking him to extend an invitation to J. Krishnamurti to speak to the students:

"I do not belong to any organization and no devotee to any religion or any particular religious teacher. I do not have any connection with Krishnamurti writing Incorporation or any gathering committees that arrange his talks here in Europe, or there in India, or elsewhere. It is not that I am interested in spreading his word but that I have often felt, and still feel, that he should be asked, if he has time, to address young people in the universities too. He has talked for 40 years. Krishnamurti is unchanged, except he, looks a little older. Isn't it extraordinary that the augury of what had once been deemed only a fancy of Theosophist-occultists, although by its own definition that legend is now false, has turned out be an outstanding prophecy. The spontaneity and freshness that radiate from every word comes like a cool mountain breeze to those who are sick to death of smelly little orthodoxies and pat philosophical and political theories."

It was a formally written letter at the request of the secretary and the yoga teacher of J. Krishnamurti.

U.G. Krishnamurti who (at the age of 89) died in Italy in 2007 as a unique personality of our times offered no real advise, no philosophy, no easy way out. He extended nothing. He was a man who looked into the heart of nothing. For him, the only freedom there is to be free from the very idea of freedom.

U.G. Krishnamurti had no wish to be either happy or great. He was only concerned with being. He looks beyond the human to the non-human, which can be discovered-within the human. His may have been a voice crying in the wilderness. He was an unmasked Rebel having no doctrine of his own.

U.G. Krishnamurti was profoundly original. To the skeptic minority of enquirers, he was fascinating perhaps more than J.Krishnamurti. An individual like U.G. can be very upsetting to those who value themselves being respectable.
To him the ground of all value is physical experience—the only reality and the only marvel is to be alive in the flesh and blood. ‘A man live in the now, if he does not, he will himself be dead in the hereafter.’ He argues that aliveness is the only thing worth cherishing. One need not despair of life. There can be no ideal goal for human life. It is in vain that we can predict and control the events in the future, unless we know how to live in the present.

U.G. Krishnamurti gives us a glimpse of the most enigmatic personality in the whole of spiritual lore—a ‘Cosmic Naxalite’ so to say.

Despite his experience of the rarest of all transformations—the death and rebirth of an ordinary human being, U.G. Krishnamurti Claims he has no message for mankind, no answer to fundamental questions, that there is no mind, no truth, and no enlightenment to be had and that thought by its very nature is fascist.

He is not a guru, not a priest, not a teacher not a savant and in fact does not intend to do anything. He burns brightly with passion and without purpose.

He emphatically says: “If you are searching for someone who will enlighten you, you have come to the wrong man.”

U.G. Krishnamurti does not claim to have any Spiritual Teachings because he questions the very idea of transformation.

It is undeniable that U.G.’s approach has the power of an uncontaminated simplicity, which because of its very nature is also deeply enigmatic.

U.G. Krishnamurti is very simple and behaves like a child. He is unique in every way. He is an undaunted spirit—a daring and fearless person.

Wherever he is people come to meet him and it is from these informal talks that several books have been compiled. The very first books: “The Mystique of Enlightenment” & “Mind is Myth”

Although, U.G. says he has nothing to say, and cannot help anyone at all, multitudes of people come to see him, some out of curiosity and some out of the hope that he will help them in some fashion.

Those who are estimating and evaluating the contribution of the two Krishnamurti to mankind, maintain that U.G. Krishnamurti begins where J. Krishnamurti ends.
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The two Krishnamurtis were born in Andhra Pradesh and grew up among the Theosophists but everything that everybody thought, felt and experienced has been thrown out of their system and what seems to have left is a pure thing—pure consciousness.

J. Krishnamurti one of the greatest spiritual teachers of this century, had cautioned about two things. In his last talk he particularly mentioned that we should not indulge in personality Cult about him. Earlier, repeatedly he had cautioned about distortion of his teachings by attempts at interpretation, which more often than not results in misinterpretation. In the spiritual and the psychological fields he repeatedly warns us against accepting anyone as an authority.

J. Krishnamurti repeatedly emphasizes, what the authorities on Psychology and knowledgeable persons in neurophysiology have found out by research on the basis of his own first hand experience.

One is not much benefited by simply going through J. Krishnamurti’s books one after another and understanding the version intellectually on the surface. The only qualification required to understanding this subject is one’s simplicity and vulnerability to the truth of the statements, patience and seriousness, which entail curiosity & interest. It is not to understand J. Krishnamurti but to come into contact with the self ‘what is’ that is important and that is what matters much or else it is futile to say that we have understood J. Krishnamurti. To live in present to see ‘what is’ are the difficult tasks one has to undertake effortlessly.

Truth is hard to find and harder still to express. Andrei Neil has said: “Krishnamurti did discover the truth about man and life. Now he seems to give all his energies to the others. It is terribly difficult and thankless job.”

That is what J. Krishnamurti did all his life: trying to express the inexpressible, to share the discovery of truth with others.

While he spoke he would pour out his heart. He did never preach nor did he teach. He was a singer of life and simultaneously he was song himself.

He was an eternal traveller upon the path of light and shadow that ever ended not. To any genuine enquirers of Real, all sort of instructions, advice, theories and such about the right way to live were nonsense, the biggest nonsense of all being
religion or i.e. teachings taught by others. Both J.K. and U.G. have discarded this in search of their true self and found that man's judgments cannot be the real as they all come from the society in which one lives and in which one has been reared. One's real self, pure and undefiled by others is supremely indifferent to any mass mania. That true self cares nothing for the world. It is completely detached: it is utterly calm and had stopped wishing, desiring.

Radha Burnier the president of the Theosophical Society on the necessity of J. Krishnamurti's teachings has said: "What Krishnamurti tried to do was to shake people out of a sense of complacency, the satisfaction or psychological comfort that might be derived from clinging on to the idea of God or security or certain fixed habits of thought, thought might fetter a person. He was such a force, he made you question everything. Question what you say? Question what you hear? Along with the questioning he has said:

"Observe everything in this state of enhanced sensitivity you will begin to see that everywhere there is a message, something is speaking. Those who are casual, slothful, seeking their own comfort never come to that precious wisdom which frees us from our problems and heals with beneficent touch the morally blind and stricken"!

Some people compare U.G. Krishnamurti to J. Krishnamurti: Now, Are there any similarities between the two Krishnamurti? Interestingly, both in some respects come from the same background but there the resemblance ends. U.G. may not have attracted the fame that J. Krishnamurti enjoyed in his lifetime whose teachings were claimed as the groundwork for bringing about a radical transformation in individuals, but still the world cannot remain indifferent to U.G. although he is not so well known in the world. His two books: "The Mystique of Enlightenment," and "Mind is a Myth" have been translated in several European languages, lately into Polish, Russian, Chinese and Japanese. U.G. Krishnamurti attracts remarkable groups of people wherever he goes. His living, just as his statements, does not fit any fixed pattern. It is very hard to escape the effects of U.G.'s conversations.

He does not wish to change or convert anyone. Then why is he so concerned about some teachers like J. Krishnamurti? Why does he involve himself in controversies? Of course, U.G. would say that he is only responding to people,
whom he says J. Krishnamurti Freaks or "widows", coming to him and asking him all these questions. He by himself has no desire to say anything.

U.G. Krishnamurti and his teaching represent the limits or end of seeking. When one is free from the seeking, then he and his teachings do not matter. Then one can drop them, as U.G. himself says: "The only freedom there is to be free from the very idea of freedom."

U.G.'s ways are like nature's ways. He does not claim to have any 'Spiritual Teachings'. He deserves a critical attention from the philosophical community, particularly in India where the traditions of all the dead generations weigh like a nightmare on the brains of the living.

The term "unrational" (not anti-rational) best describes the temper of U.G.'s philosophical approach. He is not interested in offering solutions to problems. His concern is to point out that the solution is the problem! As he often observes: The questions are born out of the answers that we already have."

The source of the questions is the answers we have picked up from our tradition. And those answers are not genuine answers. The real answer, if there is one, consists in the dissolution of both the answers and the questions inherited from tradition.

In an interview with Michel Toms for "New Dimensions", U.G. Krishnamurti suggested that if we want to radically change the human condition, we have to change human beings first, and that genetic engineering may be the most effective means to achieve that purpose.

The significance of U.G. lies in his radical and original critique to tradition, particularly the religious and spiritual tradition. His most important contribution is that, for the first time in human history, the essence of what would be considered as "spiritual Experience" is expressed in physical and physiological terms,—in terms of the functioning of the body. This opens a new perspective on human potential.

In concluding remarks whatever may be said about the merits and demerits of U.G. Krishnamurti's approach, it is undeniable that it has the power of an uncontaminated simplicity, which because of its very nature is also deeply enigmatic!
There is, yet another aspect of U.G.'s life, a totally different side of this man. He is very simple and behaves like a child. He acts, meticulously and doesn't make a mess of things. When people are in difficulties, he helps them to come out of their troubles.

U.G. Krishnamurti is at his best when he explains the chemical changes that have taken place in his body. As he observes about himself thus:

"...Whatever happened to me has happened. It seems a miracle. That is the reason why I emphasize without a shadow of doubt, that whatever has happened to me can happen a con man, to a rapist, to a murderer, or to a thief. All of them have as much a chance as, if not a better one than, all the spiritual people put together..."

"You give me a list of all the saints, sages and saviours of mankind. Then, look at their lives and look at what they did. I did everything they did. Nothing happened:......I found out that they conned themselves and conned every one of us. Was there anything to their experience which they wanted to share with the world? They were all phonics. This certainly that they were all false, and that their teachings falsified me, is something which I cannot transmit to anyone. It is your problem. As I said this morning, I had this hunger, this thirst. Nothing satisfied my hunger & my quest. You know, the old man [J. Krishnamurti] and I thrashed out everything for thirty days. I wanted to find out whether there was anything to him. He was saying something on the platform.... So I told the old man (JK). 'You can give your time to anyone you think will be helped by you.' And that finished the whole thing. That was in 1953. I never saw him afterwards!"

"....I told J. Krishnamurti that he was a stupendous hoax of the twentieth century along with Freud. I told him, "You see, you have not freed yourself from this whole idea of messiahs and Theosophy." He could not come out clean from the whole thing!"

The Gurus and God-men we have in our midst are no match to U.G. Krishnamurti— A Total Rebel and unique in every way.

He is an undaunted spirit, a daring and fearless person!!

Ancient learning may be distinguished into three periods:

(i) Its commencement, or the age of Poets,
(ii) Its maturity, or the age of philosophers;
(iii) Its decline or the age of Critics!
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The saints and the Teachers and the men as remarkable as J. Krishnamurti and U.G. Krishnamurti, die, as we all die!

When the senses are at rest, when the mind is at rest, when the intellect ceases functioning, that is the highest State.

And that true self does not die:

\[ IS \ ALAM\-AI\-HASTI \ MAIN \ NA \ JEENA \ HAI \ NA \ MARNA \ HAI, \]
\[ HAM \ NE \ KABHI \ DEKHA \ NAHIN \ MASTON \ KI \ NAZAR \ SE! \]