

**REINTERPRETING J. KRISHNAMURTI : TOWARDS A  
COMPREHENSIVE THEORY OF EDUCATION**

A Thesis submitted for  
the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Maria Emilia Menezes

Under the guidance of

Dr. A. V. Afonso  
Professor & Head  
Department of Philosophy



Goa University  
Goa.  
March - 1996

100  
MEN/Rei

T-116

~~T-41~~

Statement Under Ordinance No. 19.8 (ii)

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that Maria Emilia Menezes has satisfactorily prosecuted her course of research under the conditions prescribed by the University.

The dissertation entitled "Reinterpreting J. Krishnamurti : Towards a Comprehensive Theory of Education" is the result of her original work under my supervision. The conclusions of her study are the results of her own research. To the best of my knowledge, no part of this work has been presented to any University for any other degree.

Date: 31.3.96

  
Supervisor

D E C L A R A T I O N

The contents of the dissertation are of my findings of research done under the guidance of Dr. A.V. Afonso. I hereby declare that the dissertation or part thereof has not been previously submitted by me for a degree of any University.

Date: 31.3.96.

  
(Maria Emilia Menezes)

Just keep in mind, when you remember these moments later on, that your dialogue with nature was just the outward image of an inner dialogue with yourself.

René Daumal  
in Mount Analogue

## SYNOPSIS

A critical interpretation of Krishnamurti's philosophy reveals that he is neither located in the Indian scene nor founded on any classical western philosophy. The similarities with many contemporary western philosophers and intellectual systems are seen as expressions of the richness and universality of Krishnamurti's mind.

A re-reading of Krishnamurti's philosophy of education in terms of its basic presuppositions, resulted in a 'theory' of education or self-learning. Such a theory presupposes freedom from the known (freedom from identification with idea), cessation of thought (since thought functions as the instrument of memory and acts as a conditioning factor), fragmentation of consciousness (a product of incomplete action), mutation of mind (through a fundamental change which implies silence of thought, and therefore individual action), and self knowledge (as the way to the perception of truth). A study of Krishnamurti's theory of education is comparable with liberal philosophies of education such as reconstructionism, existentialism, pragmatism, realism and others. The humanism inherent in all these philosophies is Krishnamurti's point of departure into the new dimension of learning. In the ultimate analysis, the study reveals that Krishnamurti's philosophy of education recognizes the intuitive approach to the understanding of reality. Rather than depend on a rigid curriculum, Krishnamurti demands a spontaneous 'insight' in education. Krishnamurti's non explicit educational theory recognizes education as a humanizing force which must be paced according to the individual's own emergent needs. At the level of the curriculum it is deemed necessary to experiment with choiceless awareness in order to discover the mind which is not conditioned by the I-process, so that a new way of constructing the curriculum is created leading to 'conviviality' in learning. The real challenge of education is to create a milieu for the learner to understand himself, the mechanism of his feelings, his conditioning at home, at school and in society - to understand the whole movement of life.

## PREFACE

At the time I was finalising this study I came upon a little pocket classic 'Mount Analogue', the unfinished work of René Daumal. The point that he makes on focused perception is the point from where I took off years ago when I began my study: 'keep your eye fixed on the way to the top, but don't forget to look right in front of you. The last step depends on the first. Don't think you've arrived just because you see the summit. Watch your footing, be sure of the next step, but don't let that distract you from the highest goal. The first step depends on the last'.

To undertake a study as intensively extensive as the mind of J. Krishnamurti, though wonderfully exhilarating is not entered upon lightly, as it demands tremendous intellectual vigour which I had to be sure I would sustain with continued enthusiasm and a spirit of adventure, as I balanced on the threshold of my own 'search' for the meaning of life, after the death of my six year old son who battled with cancer.

As I look back, I realise how difficult this task has been and how impossible it would have been to achieve had it not been for the crucial role of Dr. A.V. Afonso, in this venture. He was more than a guide because he inspired the possibilities in this study, opening up windows to ever newer dimensions. When I stumbled on the ambiguity of Krishnamurti's mind (which happened often enough!) Dr. Afonso with a stretch of imagination dared me, in one wide sweep, to cover the field of philosophy, the field of psychology, and that of education (in a wholistic way!) as the only possible means of coming to terms with an understanding of Krishnamurti. This was the last step in the endeavour of work. I am deeply grateful to him for helping me take the first step. The last step depended on this.

Not everything that was written at the beginning of this study can be repeated unaltered without a second thought. But again, I have been pleasantly surprised to discover how much of it I would repeat again today not only with the same conviction but with even greater awe!

Although nothing is absolutely conclusive in this study

(Krishnamurti himself never wanted to be grounded! in conclusions and theories), my feelings are quite strong on many of the aspects discussed here and I am even more convinced that the process of subjecting educational questions to empirical analysis will always have to be in the foreground of any educational programme. It is with this in mind that I visited the Krishnamurti schools in Rajghat, Varanasi; Madras and Bangalore to actualise the experience of Krishnamurti's educational experiments.

The function of education is to help one face the world in a totally different and intelligent way. It is not simply what education teaches us directly, but how well it prepares us to learn ourselves, that is the ultimate measure of its value. This is exactly how Krishnamurti has been re-orienting our minds. I was impressed at the way his schools and "The Study" at 'Vasant Vihar' Madras are run, and this is a testimony to his greatness. The Archives of the Krishnamurti Foundation of India has systematically and intelligently computed all of the writings and talks by Krishnamurti and writings on Krishnamurti, to facilitate research students find assess even to unpublished/verbatim reports. Dr. Parchure was kind enough to permit me to use the archives without any restraints.

The recognition that this study is not in itself complete, nor entire, is in itself humanizing and it grants me the possibility of any error. This has been purely a student's exercise and even as such, only touches the periphery of the mind of Krishnamurti. He has pointed out that there cannot be a philosophy, there cannot be a theory without humanity. It is this humanism that is seen in his schools and institutions. And it is precisely this element that gave me the freedom at every stage of my work.

It is to be mentioned here that no authority is claimed for, in this study and the attitude at work here, was for me different things at different times, that is, sometimes enlightening (in a very personal way) and sometimes exasperating (at the sheer content and volume of work!). And yet while it was this and that over the last five years, it has always pushed me, one step at a time, towards this end. But is this the final step? There is a cliché that puts the whole effort in a nutshell: 'what began as a journey into another man's mind ended in an unfinished journey into mine'.

*M. E. Menezes*  
M. E. Menezes

I N D E X

---

C O N T E N T S		PAGE NO.
	INTRODUCTION	1-17
Chapter I	: LOCATING KRISHNAMURTI IN THE CONTEMPORARY INDIAN SCENE	18-39
Chapter II	: A CRITIQUE OF GENERAL PHILOSOPHY ON EDUCATION	40-105
Chapter III	: RE-READING KRISHNAMURTI AS A PHILOSOPHER OF EDUCATION	106-138
Chapter IV	: THE INNOVATIVE MOVEMENT IN EDUCATION	139-173
Chapter V	: IDEOLOGY IN THE NEXUS OF SOCIAL VALUES	174-204
Conclusion	: THE SECOND LAST WORD	205-238
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	239-250

---

## I N T R O D U C T I O N

The present study is a critical reinterpretation of J. Krishnamurti's philosophy as a holistic theory of education. Studies, thus far, have attempted to understand from both published and unpublished works, the 'mind' of Krishnamurti and thereby sketch a philosophical portrait of him. Although, it may be a 'disservice' to Krishnamurti to attempt a reconstruction of his thought, however an articulation of Krishnamurti's views on education makes it imperative that such a reconstruction be attempted. The study's basic objective is to reread Krishnamurti's philosophy in terms of its basic presuppositions, both, explicit and implicit and reconstruct a theory of education or self learning. Such a theory of education or self learning is based not only upon the fundamental concepts in Krishnamurti's teachings such as 'revelation of the self' and 'freedom from the known' but also on such other explicit exhortations found in "cessation of thought", "Self knowledge", "mutation of the mind" and "fragmentation of consciousness".

One may become more and more aware of the 'disservice' done to Krishnamurti, particularly when he has resisted the

tendency to weave his insights into a system. His thoughts, however, have much in common with schools of thought as diverse as pragmatism on the one hand and existentialism and zen on the other.

The manner in which Krishnamurti addresses his audiences both in writing and talks, and the method of self analysis he employs to prove the depths of the human mind, renders him 'unique'. The reason for Krishnamurti's unorthodox method lies, again, in the fact that he does not seek to expound a theory, formulate a thesis. In brief, he is against all forms of futile abstractions and propaganda. He instead develops in his listener a new attitude towards life, which for him is 'movement in relationship'.

Although, Krishnamurti is not 'comparable', due to the uniqueness of his thought, some attempts will be made at the secondary level to juxtapose his thought vis-a-vis other major philosophies of education. A synoptic theory of education is analysed in 5 Chapters in this dissertation.

In Chapter I entitled "Locating Krishnamurti in the Contemporary Indian Scene", an attempt is made to show how Krishnamurti's philosophy, unlike other contemporary Indian philosophies is, neither located within the Indian

tradition nor is a critical response to it. Swami Vivekananda, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Rabindranath Tagore, Sri Aurobindo and others attempted to interpret tradition/Vedanta. The essential characteristic of these philosophers is that the 'dogmas' of Indian Philosophy are inherent in them. The elaboration of these dogmas and response of these philosophers to the western critiques has been the hallmark of these philosophies. Another feature of Contemporary Indian Philosophy is that they (philosophers) attempted on the one hand to appropriate some of the 'liberal' concepts of western Christian thinkers, and on the other interpret Indian concepts on western lines. 'Reacting' to western indologists 'aggressively' or 'defensively' has been an essential feature of these philosophers and more particularly of Vivekananda, Radhakrishna<sup>n</sup> and Gandhi.

J. Krishnamurti has been a loner among these contemporary thinkers for several reasons. First, although brought up in the theosophical milieu, his writings contain no residues of the same and neither positive nor negative references to the system. Secondly, no attempt is made to defend or reflect or critically evaluate the Vedic/Vedanta tradition. There are no references to any classical or later texts both in his writings and in his talks. It is of course, appropriate to his philosophy, that no point of

departure is set from the thoughts of any philosopher, Indian or Western. Thirdly, there is a 'transcultural' dimension in his philosophy, unlike other philosophers. In other words one observes a deliberate culture neutrality in his ideas. Again, appropriate to his thought, this may be due to the fact that we have to 'free' ourselves from past knowledge. But, this 'freedom from the known' should not be interpreted within the traditional epistemological discussions. It may be stressed that one can never 'free himself' from all past experiences. In fact, all experiencing depends upon our conceptual framework, which has been created by our past experiences beginning with the formation of primitive concepts to immediate past experience. All present experiencing is due to as well as dependent upon our past experiences. In other words it is 'past knowledge' that make present experience possible. However, past knowledge plays a negative role as well. It hinders our possibility of knowing objectively. Our understanding of reality is founded on our past experiences and furthermore, past experience underwrites every present experience. In brief, 'past experiences' both contribute to the possibility of knowledge, making knowledge what it is, as well as restricting knowledge to only that knowledge made possible by the past, i.e. it does not allow knowledge to go beyond the given structures of thought.

Often the critique of Krishnamurti has pointed out that it is impossible to follow his exhortation regarding 'freedom from the known'. It is also claimed that what Krishnamurti demands is both impossible to achieve and contradictory to any epistemic theory.

An understanding of language used and the context within which the 'exhortations' have been expressed, and to critically evaluate the above "exhortations" on the basis of descriptive theory of language is a disservice to Krishnamurti. Any one who takes into account ordinary language analysis will accept that language is not only descriptive. Besides other functions it has a performative function. Krishnamurti's exhortations should not be seen in terms of universal versus particular statements, but in terms of the implicit/explicit objectives of the "exhortation". What, probably, Krishnamurti exhorts in 'freedom from the known' is related to those aspects whereby the possibility and advancement of knowledge is hindered. Even from a cursory glance at Krishnamurti's writings it is obvious that he was referring to those elements or aspects which hamper personal growth and the revelation of a pure, non coloured mind.

The unique feature of Krishnamurti's philosophy is that it is both geographically and culturally neutral. Even

western philosophical movements such as existentialism and pragmatism have cultural and geographical moorings. Krishnamurti's philosophy seems to be different from contemporary Indian and oriental Philosophy as well as from Western Philosophy. Krishnamurti's philosophical articulations, have indeed a universal 'appeal' without any cultural and geographical restrictions.

In Chapter II entitled "A Critique of General Philosophy of Education" an attempt has been made to show the inadequacies of the varied philosophies. There may be two levels of criticisms: one within each theory's framework, and, the other regarding the theory's universal adequacy. It is obvious that philosophies of education have their unarticulated theoretical presuppositions whose justification depends upon the cultural climate of the society. The presuppositions of these educational theories range from general religious and metaphysical values to commitments in political and social ideologies.

On the other hand theories of education that have transcultural dimensions and universal appeal are far in between. Such exceptional theories however, when analysed in terms of their presuppositions, seem to reveal the predominance of culture-specific elements. It is very difficult to observe the culture specific elements of

various educational philosophies. For example, the liberal art tradition, described as the earliest school of educational philosophy, with its emphasis on the study of logic, philosophy, history, literature, rhetoric and the natural sciences, aimed at collecting and synthesising information to form a base of knowledge, and in the contemplation of that knowledge, to achieve wisdom.

In contrast, Krishnamurti's educational philosophy seems to lack culture-specific relatedness. There are neither Indian cultural ethos nor Western ideological moorings in his articulation. Educational philosophy that transcends the culture-specific elements is deemed to be both universal and humanistic in character.

It is rather a simplistic argument to claim that Indian theories of education are universal in their contents. Swami Vivekananda's contribution to educational theory is often 'seen' as an unique contribution with universal appeal. But even a cursory glance will reveal the cultural predetermination of Vivekananda's philosophy. Attempts by authors to selectively quote Vivekananda so as to prove the universality of his thought, have failed. The basic objectives of Vivekananda's thought, namely, a reinterpretation of Vedic philosophy so as to revive the 'lost' tradition, prove beyond reasonable doubt the fact

that he positively reacted to Western philosophy in general and to educational philosophy in particular. Another case of such specific articulations in education is that of Tagore and Mahatma Gandhi. In these cases too, except for the extent of appropriation of Western philosophy, their educational philosophy seemed to be a response to Western philosophical tradition which was seen as a threat to Indian tradition.

It would have been appropriate to state the general philosophy of Krishnamurti before analysing his contribution to a theory of education. The study, however, takes a different strategy on the basis of certain insights into his philosophy and attempts to 'view' educational perspective in every philosophical concept. In Chapter III entitled "Re-reading Krishnamurti as a Philosopher of Education" therefore an attempt is made to show that the overriding concern of his philosophy was education of the self. There have been several philosophical inquiries into Krishnamurti's thought. Varied claims have been made in an effort to reconstruct a metaphysics or an ethics or social philosophy of Krishnamurti. This is done by "picking and choosing" texts or sentences appropriate to specific disciplines. The critiques among them however point out to the fragmented nature of his thought, according to them, does not afford a coherent reconstruction of his thought.

The dialogic exhortationist language of his writings and discourses amplifies the seeming contradiction in his mind. It is not surprising therefore, that the critiques quote contradictory exhortations to highlight the 'fragmented' nature of his thought.

In the present dissertation it is however, argued that the seeming contradictions are neither contradictions nor anomalies of his thought. Two strategies are adopted in understanding Krishnamurti. First, contextualising his thought will reveal both the general and specific presuppositions and imperatives of his exhortations whether in books, discourses or epistles. Secondly, by employing the techniques of ordinary language analysis, it becomes obvious that language is not merely descriptive but also performative. Applying Austin's locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary uses of language we will be able see how Krishnamurti is not concerned in presenting a thesis in metaphysics or ethics or social philosophy. His sole concern seems to be man in totality, not fragmented in consciousness, free from negative childhood conditioning and capable of a "wholesome life".

The study of Krishnamurti's ideas reveal his concern for 'educating man' in this direction. "Re-reading" Krishnamurti is reading between the lines of the text as

well as interpreting the context within which the exhortations were made. And such a "re-reading" reveals Krishnamurti's philosophical concerns with deep social and psychological analysis comprising a holistic theory of education. Although a pedantic categorization of Krishnamurti's ideas into philosophical and educational would detract the focus from the totality of his teachings, the perspective on which Krishnamurti's educational ideas crystallized cannot be ignored.

In Chapter IV entitled "The Innovative Movement in Education" an attempt is made to convey a comprehensive gist of the philosophical ideas of Krishnamurti which reject culture and reason in favour of nature and intuition. It is seen how his teachings give an insight into the state of being in which action is total and complete, immediate and spontaneous and based not on ideas but on the intuitive perception of the oneness of all life. Krishnamurti does not propound an educational theory, and it is conclusive that his teaching is not through a process of discursive reasoning but proceeds from a central standard of truth. Human life is a struggle between what is and what should be. The aim in education is self-integration and Krishnamurti emphasises that a psychological revolution can take place only when we understand the process of our own thinking and when we free

ourselves from the authority of the self-centre to become 'one with all'. Hence he talks of a psychological transformation in relationship.

In order to understand the importance of individuality in education Krishnamurti likens the concept of individual 'being' to that of the pure 'Being', where there is no awareness of 'you' and 'I'. He therefore stresses on the importance of pure awareness which is effortless consciousness, which again is discernment, and has the capacity to comprehend ultimate values. In this chapter we also see how a radical transformation in our society can only be brought about through a radical change in the individual.

The value structure inherent in the pattern of this relationship between human beings is what constitutes society, i.e. individuals have created society as a result of this relationship. However, Krishnamurti also points out how when the relationship is structured on extrinsic values then action is conditioned by motive. Accordingly, traditional means have failed to solve the chaos in society. Krishnamurti contends that the resultant psychological division or fragmentation of consciousness in each individual is what finally brings about the disintegration of the individual. Therefore he stresses on

a mutation of mind to restore peace to every individual. We see here how Krishnamurti advocates action based on an intelligent understanding of life as a whole. Thus, the cessation of fragmentation of consciousness can happen only in the discovery of what is truth and truth can only be discovered in the choiceless awareness of the psychological structure of the self.

In this chapter we also discuss how self knowledge is the only practical approach to the problem of our existence. The awakening of intelligence leading to self knowledge and emancipation from the self imposed limitations is the point at which the individual can operate upon society to bring about a social change. According to the Marxist theory, ideology is equated with consciousness and ideology is a result of 'thought'. Hence a revolution in this sense would only imply a modification of pattern. Such a change is not radical. What Krishnamurti advocates is a revolution within the structure of the psyche. It is only such a revolution that can transform the individual and society at large. Now since thought is a response to <sup>thought?</sup> memory it is of the past. Action based on thought is limited and cannot be revolutionary. Likewise, perception is defined by thought hence such action is not spontaneous. This leads to the fact that thought cannot

capture the whole, and, to the important conclusion that thought is fragmentary. Hence Krishnamurti implores for a revolution beyond thought, for the radical transformation of the psyche which in turn will bring about a transformation in society.

We also see how Krishnamurti assigns sterling value to freedom. But the limitations of this freedom is desire which creates choice. But according to Krishnamurti choice is not implied as freedom and he goes on to describe a process of actualisation which is the pursuit of the actual and which ends the state of becoming. Freedom therefore is not a means to an end i.e. to be this or that through choice; it is not the opposite of bondage. Freedom is a flowering and according to Krishnamurti it means to be what is, that is, to be in a state of choicelessness, or 'choiceless awareness'. Awareness perceives the fact by thought. It is only cessation of thought that leads to self knowledge.

We see here that Krishnamurti points at how the present is conditioned by memory, thought and desire. The nervous system oscillates between the object and its meaning and language influences the way we perceive the world. But Krishnamurti says that the word is not the object it designates and language creates a dichotomy between subject

and object. But language affects our perception of the world. It is this fact that directs us to the need to make our teaching practice more individualistic. Individual sense of I-ness is also discussed in this chapter. This sense of I-ness arises out of intellectual, emotional and physical set of conditions which create an illusion of the entity causing conditioning of intelligence that results in the individual being self centred by shutting off from the wholeness of life.

Krishnamurti insists that it is important to concentrate on the now. In Gestalten terms - fluid gestalten is not possible if we hang on to the past as the past conditions the present.

In phenomenological approach we are concerned with the fact as it is, i.e. awareness; and in the behavioural approach with emphasis on behaviour in the now. This brings integration of consciousness and ending of psychological time which interferes with perception and action, causing resultant loss of energy and loss of oneness as akin to gestalten fluidity.

Krishnamurti insists that true education should lead the individual to actualise himself and live for the present, not live instead for an idea and the actualisation of that

idea. Krishnamurti talks instead of all actions having an instinctive immediacy. In the above state Krishnamurti feels that students are subjected to a goal oriented climate, reinforcing the child's ego, causing divisiveness and resultant fragmentation of consciousness.

Hence we see that the ending of thought is of paramount importance if we are to end this psychological divisiveness. Krishnamurti feels that unless we allow the movement of the whole undivided mind where there is no observer separate from the observed, we will not be able to end the tyranny of thought. It is only when this happens that intelligence is awakened. At this point too the significance of the practice of attention is discussed. Attention is not the opposite of non attention, and it is also not the result of any state.

We see here how attention simply means observing without motive and being sensitive. When there is attention in learning, then there is no motivational problem. In this discussion Krishnamurti crosses the threshold of conventionality and breaks into the frontier of Quantum physics, reassembling time and space into a new geometry that has no beginning or end, that is in the now.

In Chapter V entitled "Ideology in the Nexus of Social

Values" an attempt is made to perceive the school as a social reality in terms of an institutional venture. According to Krishnamurti, the individual is not an isolated entity and is to be considered in relationship to society. Hence the study brings out the dialectical relationship between Krishnamurti's educational ideology and the institutions that he created towards this end. We also see how Krishnamurti's educational ideas created as great an impact on contemporary pedagogic trends as the educational doctrines of educationists like Froebel, Montessori and Rousseau.

Finally, the principles of education, the setting of objectives and well devised curriculums are external prerequisites to be fulfilled, but the heart of the matter is the quality of the 'learning' that goes on and which depends largely on the quality of teaching. It has to be understood that an educational ideology has to ultimately operate within the nexus of existing social values which in turn places certain constraints on the practical aspects of implementation of any educational programme.

The work concludes with comments and suggestions on the lines of inquiry that arise in the course of this study. This part of the work has been carefully entitled as 'The

Second Last Word' since J. Krishnamurti's 'mind' cannot be contained in a conclusion or a theory.

More specifically education should be a humanizing force paced according to the individual's emergent needs. At the level of the curriculum it is deemed necessary to experiment with choiceless awareness in order to discover the mind which is not conditioned by the I-process, so that a new way of constructing the curriculum is created leading to 'conviviality' in learning. The real challenge of education is to create a milieu for the learner to understand himself, the mechanism of his feelings, his conditioning at home, at school and in society - to understand the whole movement of life.

## CHAPTER I

### LOCATING KRISHNAMURTI IN THE CONTEMPORARY INDIAN SCENE

In this chapter, an attempt is made to show how Krishnamurti's philosophy, unlike other Contemporary Indian Philosophies, is, neither located within the Indian tradition nor is it a response to it.<sup>1</sup> Swami Vivekananda, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Rabindranath Tagore, Sri Aurobindo, Mahatma Gandhi, Servapalli Radhakrishnan are philosophers who seem to find mention in any Contemporary Indian philosophy study or anthology. Similarly, Ramakrishna, Muhammad Iqbal, K.C. Bhattacharya are often included in the period and philosophies of Indian Renaissance. The essential characteristics of these philosophies (with the exception of K.C. Bhattacharya's academic writings) is that the 'dogmas'<sup>2</sup> of Indian Philosophy are inherent in them. The elaboration of these dogmas and response of these philosophers to the western critiques has been the general feature of these philosophies. Attempts have been made by contemporary critiques of Indian Philosophy to 'shift' some essential features with a view of determining what is constant to such philosophizing. Radhakrishnan, for instance argued: "If we can abstract from the variety of opinion and observe the general spirit of Indian thought,

we shall find that it has a disposition to interpret life and nature and nature in the way of monistic idealism".<sup>3</sup> But many other critics like Das Gupta recognize some fundamental concepts common to various systems as the essential features of Indian Philosophy. R. Puligandla for instance, observes moksha, atman, karma and dharma as distinguishing marks of Indian philosophy.<sup>4</sup> Many contemporary historians of philosophy<sup>5</sup> question such a characterization of Indian Philosophy. But the tradition of Renaissance thinkers seem to reinforce the understanding of Indian Philosophy in terms of dominant themes listed above.

Contemporary Indian Philosophers have attempted to appropriate some of the 'liberal' concepts of Western Christian thinkers, on the one hand and interpret Indian philosophical concepts on western lines, on the other. In brief, 'reacting' to western indologists 'aggressively' or 'defensively' has been the 'hall-mark' of the writings of philosophers of this period, particularly of Vivekananda, Radhakrishnan and Gandhi.

Indian Philosophy is seen by some contemporary interpreters<sup>6</sup> as being at the cross-roads of tradition and modernity. Tradition, with its inner resilience, has to

undergo change when confronted by science and technology on the one hand, and, positivistic and utilitarian attitudes on the other. One may lament that the rich Indian tradition and philosophy suffered during the long periods of Mughal and British rules.<sup>7</sup> But the most discerning feature of contemporary Indian philosophy is the individual and collective intellectual canvas of renaissance thinkers who not only learnt the Western European languages, but internalized the whole liberal tradition of the West. Contemporary Indian Philosophers have, consciously or otherwise, attempted an East-West synthesis, wherein, metaphysical elements of classical Indian philosophy are seen or interpreted on the lines of western religious dogmas. It is not surprising that, in terms of 'motives', both Indian scholars of Indian Philosophy, and western scholars of Indian Philosophy have attempted the same task. Western scholars such as Max Muller, Zimmer and others using their western liberal framework and Christian religious dogmas sought to clarify Indian concepts to western readers. Similarly, contemporary Indian (Renaissance) thinkers re-wrote classical Indian philosophy with 'refinements' (instead of going back to 'roots') in language and 'lore' so that Western minds could comprehend.

It is not surprising, therefore, that some critiques label contemporary Indian philosophy as 'interpretative' and not

creative. This criticism may be ill founded as there may not be any dividing line between the two. Besides, one may interpret 'creativity' as interpretation, and similarly, one may argue for 'creative' interpretation, whereby the concept of interpretation itself undergoes a radical shift. What is, however, pertinent for our discussion is that Contemporary Indian Philosophers (with the exception of J. Krishnamurti) had as their canvas the classical Indian philosophy and tradition (religion and culture) and consequently, the umbilical cord that binds one to tradition though often strained, was never snapped off to give rise to an entirely new philosophical framework.

Although the comparisons may seem inadequate in another context, for the present, one may point out that inspite of a strong presence of Christian dogma, the West gave rise to philosophies such as Positivism, Existentialism, Marxism and Analytic philosophy.

Historians, confronted by certain critiques tend to be apologetic about the nature and function of Contemporary Indian Philosophies. That a period in history did not produce thinkers with synoptic works, cannot belittle the contribution of such scholars. Eighteenth and Nineteenth century India may not have given rise to distinct systems

comparable to Samkhya and Mimamsa. But contemporary Indian philosophers like Vivekananda and Ramakrishna, Aurobindo and Tagore, Radhakrishnan and Iqbal, Gandhi and M.N. Roy have attempted a rational reconstruction of systems often devoid of rigorous logical analysis and essential social justifications. Vishwanath S. Naravne,<sup>8</sup> noting the absence of synoptic thinkers among the Contemporary Indian Philosophers, sought praise of the thinkers by quoting Will Durant, Thoreau, and other western writers. The point of departure for the historians of Contemporary Indian Philosophies, however, should have been the extent of analysis of both arguments of the thinkers, the theoretical and social reconstruction provided and the study of the extent of influence on the succeeding generation of thinkers.

There are historians of philosophy who locate positivism in Democritus and Francis Bacon, existentialism in St. Augustine, Marxism in Prophet Amos and Analytic Philosophy in Thomas Aquinas. Such comparative studies though historically useful may not wholly explain the rise and growth of these new philosophies.

In contemporary Indian philosophy speculative in the sense of being meditative as American philosophy is pragmatic or French philosophy is rationalistic and so on and so forth,

classifying ideas and intellectual traditions is the task of historians of philosophy. A noted scholar<sup>9</sup> had labeled K.C. Bhattacharya as an Idealist, M.N. Roy as an empiricist, Rabindranath Tagore as a neo Hindu Spiritualist, and so on. However such a labeling is not only unfair to the complexity of thought of the individual thinkers, but unimaginative in the absence of clarification regarding what constitutes such terms.

Most contemporary Indian Philosophers do not undermine the 'spiritual' element in their speculations. And this element is seen from their use of intuition as a method of understanding reality. The vision or darsana of reality, which is a common mode of speculation or 'meditative method' renders most of contemporary Indian philosophy spiritual or quasi-spiritual. This feature of the dominant philosophizing in the classical period, particularly Vedic and Upanishadic, seem to continue to dominate the modes of philosophizing of most of the contemporary Indian Philosophers, particularly Vivekananda, Tagore, Radhakrishnan and Gandhi. In other words, Contemporary Indian Philosophy shares with the classical period certain features that include both the method and the content of philosophizing. If one ventures to compare with Contemporary Western Philosophical trends, one could say that Contemporary Indian Philosophy concentrates on

rational justification of accepted truths of intuition. The logic employed, the critique developed and the rational demonstrations provided are all attempts to prove what is otherwise 'intuitively' or 'speculatively' known to be true. One is reminded of Medieval Western Philosophy, particularly under the influence of Thomas Aquinas, that looked upon philosophy as the 'hand-maid' of theology.

One, however, notices among contemporary Indian Philosophy certain tradition. For instance, unlike the classicist, the contemporary Indian philosophies are concerned with the tragic suffering of mankind (the existential aspects of reality). The present is not treated or deemed to be an illusion.

Radhakrishnan, Tagore and others recognize the fact of reality, both of ourselves and of the external world as important for spiritual growth. Besides, the world is never treated as unreal and the dignity of man is never undermined. This is prominently clear even in Aurobindo<sup>10</sup> where inspite of advocating monism, the dignity of man and the reality of human freedom is upheld.

Contemporary Indian Philosophers seem to be in total agreement regarding their concern for man. A humanism underlying the writings of all these thinkers show an

unquestionable link between humanitarian and material pursuits, thereby differentiating them from the Western style of 'scientific humanism' based upon the development of science and technology. With the probable exception of M.N.Roy, Contemporary Indian philosophers could be labeled as 'spiritual humanists', whereby rendering synonymous 'humanism' and 'dharma', the 'process of bringing out that what is essential to man as man'.<sup>11</sup>

As much as all Contemporary Indian Philosophers have a deep sense of appreciation of Indian tradition, they have in equal manner recognized and addressed themselves to the negative or 'darker' aspects of this tradition. Whether it is Ram Mohan Roy, Aurobindo, Gandhi, Tagore or Nehru, they all recognize the undesirable elements of continuity. They all functioned simultaneously as proponents of classical Indian philosophy and culture and critiques of the negative influences of this culture on the masses of Indian populace. It is in this second role that Contemporary Indian Philosophers are by and large social philosophers and activists defending the classical tradition and at the same time attempting to purge it from the 'dehumanizing' elements. They, particularly Ram Mohan Roy, Tagore, Vivekananda and Gandhi paradoxically accepted and rejected tradition while reinterpreting and reassessing it in the light of their experience.

The difference between Indian Renaissance (18th and 19th century) and its Western counterpart (15th-16th century) is that Indian tradition and culture has continuity, assimilating new elements from the interacting cultures at the sametime retaining that what is deemed to be of eternal value i.e. spiritualism. The two dominant western cultural traditions (Islam and Christianity) which influenced Indian culture bringing about subtle changes in varied aspects of Indian thought in the 18th-19th century, absorbed the two currents of 'alien' civilization. The theistic humanistic religious outlook is the result of such amalgamation and can be recognized as a characteristic of the philosophers of the period. R.S. Srivastava<sup>12</sup> while introducing Contemporary Indian Philosophers identified certain aspects as 'salient features' of the philosophy of the period. He claims that contemporary Indian philosophy is characterized by (i) positive attitude towards the world; (ii) having a cosmic and spiritualistic outlook; (iii) integral and synthetic; (iv) reconciling theism and absolutism; (v) monism of spirit and matter; (vi) self-activity and spiritual; (vii) accepting evolution of Superman or Gnostic Beings; (viii) recognizing new approaches to salvation; (ix) a system that is dynamic, open and universal; and (x) humanistic.

The first feature mentioned above can be deduced from the

fact that unlike Sankara, Contemporary Indian philosophers such as Vivekananda and Gandhi view the world as real (not illusory) and spiritual. The cosmic or collectivistic as against individualistic orientation of Sankhya, Nyaya, Mimamsa and Advaita, can be seen from the fact that salvation is perceived not as an individual effort but within a perfect environment and with the involvement of the whole of mankind. The writings of Radhakrishnan and Sri Aurobindo bring out clearly these elements. Further, the influence Western education has exercised on the minds of Radhakrishnan, Tagore, Aurobindo and others have resulted in a philosophy which is synthetic rather than exclusive and parochial. Again, these philosophers have reconciled an impersonal Brahman, that is looked upon as pure existence, truth and reality with a personal God, the merciful and just creator (recognized in writings of Western Christian writings).

The most important feature is the reconciliation of Monism of Spirit and Matter that is attempted in Aurobindo. What one notices is the fact that Contemporary Indian Philosophers seem to attempt to reconcile the 'irreconcilables' of classical Indian philosophy. In other words, uneasy with the logical dilemmas, Contemporary Indian Philosophers attempted to rid philosophy of the contradictions and antinomies highlighted by the Western

critiques.

13

R.N. Sharma characterizes Contemporary Indian Philosophy as unity of metaphysics, cosmology and axiology. The tradition of Indian philosophy under the influence of western philosophy, science, social reforms, political consciousness expressed in literature, art and other humanistic writings has resulted in a Neo-Vedanta Metaphysics. And of the Vedantins, most Contemporary Indian Philosophies recognize Brahama as the Ultimate and Absolute Reality. The term 'neo' refers in different contexts to different aspects of Vedanta that were questioned or corrected. For instance, mayavadda was questioned by Aurobindo and never accepted by Gandhi or Tagore. Although Vivekananda argued for Sanakara's mayavadda at the metaphysical level, he never preached that world is an illusion. All emphasized that multiplicity is as much real as the unity.

The neo-Vedanta philosophy retains the basic facet of Vedanta, wherein the essential spiritual unity of Brahman is never questioned. Individuality and collectivity are merely expressions of this essential unity or divine power, and <sup>the</sup> principles governing them are <sup>the</sup> same. Further, the principles governing the social relationships were entangled (!) with the axiological principles such as Karma

theory and the theory of Rebirth which led to the discrimination of and exploitation of the weak, and the resultant social indifference. Contemporary Indian Philosophers have addressed themselves to social problems because of which the metaphysical and cosmological elements of Vedanta were questioned. Mayavada, Karma theory, Moksha have all come under philosophical scrutiny as these concepts were seen as detrimental to a social philosophy that recognizes the intrinsic worth of every human being. As a result, at the epistemological level, Vedanta philosophy negated worldly knowledge since they considered only one type of knowledge, namely, knowledge of phenomena.

The neo-vedanta philosophy advocated by Contemporary Indian Philosophers brought about a synthesis between vedantic individualism and modern collectivism, and permitted a socio-political philosophy that upheld freedom of the individual and made possible a socialistic, scientific, rationalistic, pluralistic philosophy with an integral understanding of world reality.

What seems to have been attempted by various scholars of contemporary Indian philosophy while trying to understand its nature is a Wittgenstenian exercise.<sup>14</sup> The failure on the part of the writers to identify one or some features as common to all the contemporary Indian philosophers,

compelled them to give up essentialism. Instead they focussed on features that seem to have been shared by these philosophers. Besides, the metaphysically inclined among them (viz. Aurobindo, Vivekananda) among these have clearly admitted to one or many of the features discussed above. The social and political philosophers have implicit to their ideas such features, though not articulated in details.

Krishnamurti has been a loner among these contemporary thinkers for several reasons. It is not at all easy to put Krishnamurti into a system and for that matter even to try to assert that his holistic approach may be connected with a long tradition. Although Krishnamurti was brought up in the theosophical milieu, his teachings contain no residue of the same, neither does he make any positive or negative references to the system. Secondly, no attempt is made to defend, reflect, or critically evaluate the Vedic/Vedanta tradition. As a renowned 'non-guru' Krishnamurti differs fundamentally from most philosophers, repudiating any attempt to place his teachings under the term philosophy. He has resisted this tendency to weave his insights into a system - but in the final analysis, in the choice of some word to describe his approach of life, 'philosophy' comes nearest to what he has been trying to convey. Both Indian and Western thinkers have contributed to a greater or

lesser extent to the understanding of man's condition here on earth and this quest is divided between philosophy, psychology and social sciences. Many thinkers have stretched their thought to include all the three dimensions while a few have departed from this course of search in regions unexplored. It would be appropriate to qualify him, in a way, to this latter category.

As Krishnamurti was acknowledged to be an extra-ordinary personality right from his childhood, most of all his public utterances have been recorded with reliable authenticity around which a tremendous literature has grown in his name and much of which are primarily his own articulations. It is interesting to note that right across the wide spectrum of the ideas he tried to convey in his writings and in his talks, there are no references to any classical or later texts. Every series of Krishnamurti's talks may represent a complete exposition of his thesis though often any one of this talks aimed only at one particular theme or subject. The particularly distinct character of his talks and deliberations is the fact that he did not speak on a declared subject and no point of departure is set from the thoughts of any philosopher, whether Indian or Western. The reason for Krishnamurti's unorthodox methods lies in the fact that he does not seek to frame a theory or philosophy, or formulate a concept.

His approach is an exercise in self analysis. Therefore any attempt to present his teachings must be in an atmosphere of freedom from adherence to any particular philosophy, to any particular system of thought or to any particular ideological background. There is a transcultural dimension in his philosophy or to put it more accurately, there is a deliberate culture neutrality<sup>15</sup> in his ideas.

16

Krishnamurti is not fanatic about spiritual authority or tradition. His way of expression is free from all the traditional terminology of the Indian philosophical genius and he addresses the contemporary mind in modern terms, not coloured by eastern or western cultural hues.

Krishnamurti's culture neutrality is clearly manifest in his thought that we have to 'free' ourselves from past knowledge. But this 'freedom from the known' is not to be interpreted within the traditional epistemological discussions. It may be stressed that one can never 'free himself' from all past experiences. In fact, all experiencing depends upon our conceptual framework, which has been created by our past experiences beginning with the formation of primitive concepts to immediate past experience. All present experiencing is due to, as well as dependent upon our past experiences. In other words it is

'past knowledge' that makes present experience possible.

However, past knowledge plays a negative role as well. It hinders the possibility of knowing objectively. Our understanding of reality is founded on our past experiences and furthermore, past experience underwrites every present experience. In brief, past experiences both contribute to the possibility of knowledge, making knowledge what it is, as well as restricting knowledge to only that knowledge made possible by the past i.e. it does not allow knowledge to go beyond the given structures of thought.

Often the critique of Krishnamurti has pointed out that it is impossible to follow his exhortation regarding 'freedom from the known'. It is also claimed that what Krishnamurti demands is both impossible to achieve and contradictory to any epistemic theory.

What Krishnamurti tries to convey here is the freedom from the limitations of consciousness, and, that can come about through the understanding of the significance of freedom, which lies in being choicelessly aware of the limitations of self consciousness. According to Krishnamurti, freedom is necessary for the discovery of truth, but freedom is not a means to a projected end. And as long as the mind is not free from the desire 'to be' the mind cannot be silent and

capable of total attention. What Krishnamurti stresses here is freedom from identification with idea or belief. Krishnamurti has a peculiar expression for this state: 'the emptying of the mind'. It is in this state of the mind that the limitations of truth can be found.

Hence, in essence, what Krishnamurti tries to articulate here is that it is only when the mind is free from seeking, from craving in its various forms, that it is capable of communing with the whole. When the mind looks at life partially as 'you' and 'me'; as the 'subject' and the 'object', then it is not capable to commune with the 'whole'.

Thus it is seen than an understanding of the language used and the context within which the 'exhortations' have been expressed will not be adequate to imply what Krishnamurti attempts to convey. Hence to critically evaluate the above 'exhortations on the basis of descriptive theory of language is a disservice to Krishnamurti's teachings. Krishnamurti has said time and again that agreeing or disagreeing with him is irrelevant. But understanding him is the important quotient. Luis S.R. Vas<sup>17</sup> puts it succinctly: "One suddenly realises then that it is not a matter of judging Krishnamurti. For Krishnamurti never pretended to make you understand him. He merely hopes to

provoke you into understanding your self, into seeing through yourself. So there is no question of judging yourself either".

Anything that takes into account ordinary language analysis will accept that language is not only descriptive. Besides other functions it has a performative function. Krishnamurti's exhortations should not be seen in terms of universal versus particular statements, but in terms of the implicit/explicit objectives of the "exhortation". What probably Krishnamurti exhorts in 'freedom from the known' is related to those aspects whereby the possibility and advancement of knowledge is hindered. Even from a cursory glance at Krishnamurti's writings it is obvious that he was referring to those elements or aspects which hamper a personal growth and the revelation of a pure, non coloured mind.

The unique feature of Krishnamurti's philosophy is that it is both geographically and culturally neutral.<sup>18</sup> Even Western philosophical movements such as existentialism and pragmatism have cultural and geographical moorings. Krishnamurti's philosophy seems to be different from contemporary Indian and Oriental philosophy.<sup>19</sup> His exceptionally intuitive approach is not through a process of discursive reasoning but proceeds from a central

standard of truth. He does not propound any doctrines nor does he preach any dogma.

His teachings are free from dogmatism, and superstition; and yet truly universal and capable of appealing to the heart. He discovers truth afresh when confronted with a problem, in the way of creative thinking and clear perception and shows the way to freeing the mind from the limitations of self consciousness, leading to the fulfillment of the human being.

## NOTES

1. There has been various ways in which the geographical and temporal limitation of Contemporary Indian Philosophies or Philosophers was attempted. For the present study the researcher has taken a broad definition that includes the Renaissance thinkers of 18th and 19th century, that saw social, political and intellectual revival in the sub-continent.
2. The term 'dogma' is used in the sense employed by Surendranath Das Gupta (Philosophical Essays, Delhi: Motilal Bararsidas, 1982). "Dogma" is treated as an article of faith, belief, as against reasoned philosophical conclusion, hence 'unproved' and of unknown origin. The arguments that are adduced in its support are at best 'trivial'.
3. S. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Vol. I, London: George Alen & Unwin, 1923, p. 32.
4. R. Puligandla, Fundamentals of Indian Philosophy, Nashville: Abigdon Press, 1975.
5. D. P. Chattopadhyaya in What is Living and What is Dead in Indian Philosophy, N.Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1976, and Indian Philosophy: A Popular Introduction, N.Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1972, sees 'materialism' as a dominant theme while reconstructing 'relevant' philosophical systems. Similar attempts to deny 'dominant themes' is made by Daya Krishnan ("Three Myths About Indian Philosophy"). Quest, 53, 1967, and by Rajendra Prasad ("The concept of Moksa"), Philosophy and the Phenomenological Research, XXI, 3, 1971.
6. B.K. Lal, Contemporary Indian Philosophy, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989; V.S. Naravana, Modern Indian Thought, New Delhi:Orient Longman, 1978. R.N. Sharma, Contemporary Indian Philosophy, N. Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 1991.
7. R.S. Srivastava, Contemporary Indian Philosophy, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Pvt. Ltd., 1983.

8. V.S. Naravane, Modern Indian Thought, N.Delhi: Orient Langman, 1978, p. 8-10.
9. K. Satchitananda Murthy, Philosophy in India: Tradition, Teaching and Research, New Delhi : Motilal Banarsidas, 1985, p.100.
10. Robert McDermott, (ed.) The Essential Aurobindo, N.Y.: Schocken Books, 1974.
11. T.M.P. Mahadevan and G.V. Saroja, Contemporary Indian Philosophy, N.D.: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1981.
12. Srivastava R.S., 1983, pp. 1-20.
13. R.N. Sharma, 1991, pp. 14-18.
14. L. Wittgenstein In Philosophical Investigations while attacking 'essentialism' claimed that objects or meanings cannot be explained in terms of one or set of characteristics. Instead, a set of features shared by a thing/concepts will explain why a single general name is applicable to it/them. The theory of 'family resemblances' may or may not explain 'meaning theory, - but in case of Contemporary Indian Philosophers, it surely gives us a better insight into their philosophies.
15. Krishnamurti says that the mind must be completely free from all conditioning so that a totally different kind of life can be lived. But to achieve this he says "there must be freedom to observe, not as a Christian, a Hindu, a Dutchman, a German ... " (Krishnamurti, The Flight of the Eagle, KF1, 1971, P.55). One cannot help at times feel the contradiction of this, when he is referred to as Hindu Brahmin a countless number of times, in most of the biographical data. A brahmin is one of the classes of social distinction into which the Hindus are divided according to the religious law of Brahmanism. One cannot but wonder if Krishnamurti thought of this categorization as oppressive to his universal views and ever attempted to arrest it. Or was he plainly indifferent to it?
16. In ordinary circumstances, the line dividing Spiritualism and Ritualism is narrow to the extent of contiguously linking both, resulting in ritualism detracting the focus from the search for fundamental Truth.
17. Vas, Luis S.R., The Mind of Krishnamurti, Jaico

Publishing House, Bombay, 1971, p.287.

18. Krishnamurti Foundation set up schools in India as well as in England (Brockwood Park), California (U.S.A.), (Oak Groove) Canada (Wolf Lake School) and other countries, to create a milieu where the teachings of Krishnamurti could be communicated to the young minds. Although the schools are spread across the world, his universal ideas of 'learning to learn' are transported from continent to continent without the interference of cultural and geographical denominators (and with tremendous success!).
19. Although his philosophy is radically different from any oriental philosophy, his flashes of insight can be off handedly likened to some of the best intuitive aphorism of Laotse as he speaks to the heart and comes 'closer to truth' than any philosopher other than Laotse has ever come to.

## CHAPTER II

### A CRITIQUE OF GENERAL PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

In a basic sense, philosophy of education is the application of philosophical ideas to educational problems. Conversely, the practice of education leads to a refinement of philosophical ideas. As the practice of education has developed, so also have theories about education. The tendency however is to overlook the connection between theory and practice and to deal with practice apart from theory. Theorizing about education without consideration of the 'practical' world, implies that philosophers of education become web-spinners of thought, engaged in mere academic exercises. Equally despairing is tinkering with educational methods without theorizing which results in practices that have little substance or meaning.

It is amazing to note that many great philosophers have written about education. This situation arises probably because education is such an integral part of life that it is difficult to think about not having it. Thus, thinking about life in general has often been connected or related to education in particular. Education has always been

viewed as a way of bringing a better life into existence.

Although the study of philosophy will not necessarily make us better thinkers or educators, it does provide a strong base to help us think of new developments in the educative process. The study of philosophy offers an avenue for serious enquiry into traditions and ideas in education. Philosophers have from time immemorial always been acute observers of the human condition and have articulated their observations in ways that are instructive. On the other hand, educators are not only aided by a careful and systematic approach to ideas that philosophers have fostered, but they can also gain fresh insights from philosophy and develop new strategies to deal with educational problems.

Philosophy has an important role to play in analyzing critically the intellectual tools of any given era. Another role of philosophy has been to suggest alternative methods of thinking. Yet another important contribution has been to develop sensitivity to the language and logic used in constructing solutions to problems in education and society. Hence the outcome of this exercise is that it is possible to trace the history of ideas and the impact that is created in the educative process by tracing the development of philosophical thought.

The educational process achieves the optimum effect when it draws in from philosophy viz. the understanding of thinking processes and the nature of ideas, the language used to describe education and how these may interact at a practical level. For the educator, philosophy has a greater significance and is not merely a professional tool, but a way of improving the quality of life since it gives a wider perspective to human existence. The approach taken in this chapter is directed towards the development of understanding of the nature of philosophy in relation to educational issues. The focus, therefore in this chapter is to show how philosophical thought, even thought contained in ancient philosophies, has influenced education. The study of philosophy of education is a challenge, as it enables to develop the kind of perspective and intellectual tools that help deal with the educational problems of today. A brief review of the philosophies of Idealism, Realism, Pragmatism, Reconstructionism, Existentialism and Behaviourism and the study of the principles of liberal education undertaken in this chapter will perhaps give the framework to the perspective upon which Krishnamurti's ideas on education crystallized.

Idealism is perhaps the oldest systematic philosophy in Western culture dating back as early as Plato<sup>1</sup>\* who developed one of the most influential philosophies dealing

with education. The basis of idealism is that ideas are the only true reality and that the material world is characterized by change. In order to achieve a better understanding of idealism in education a brief exploration of three areas will be attempted in this discussion viz. Platonic idealism, religious idealism and modern idealism.

In Platonic idealism man should be primarily concerned with the search for truth, (meaning universal truths in areas such as politics, religion and education). In The Republic<sup>2</sup> Plato wrote about the separation of the world of ideas from the world of matter. According to him, man needs to free himself from a concern with matter so that he can advance toward the Good. This can be done through the use of dialectic in which one moves from mere opinion to true knowledge. The 'dialect' looks at both sides of an issue, that is, it maintains a critical perspective.<sup>3</sup> To Plato, the dialectic was a means of assisting man in moving from a concern with the material world to a concern with the world of ideas. In The Republic, the allegory of the cave conveys the meaning that the ascent towards wisdom is painfully difficult as well as potentially dangerous (note Plato's admonition that the man, now the philosopher, who has advanced into the realm of true knowledge must return to the cave to enlighten his fellow men).

In the educational perspective therefore, the 'allegory of the cave' has a poignant resemblance in that we ourselves are living in a cave of shadows, ignorance and illusions. To disengage from these chains, marks the beginning of our education. The steep ascent represents the dialect that will transport us from the world of matter to the world of ideas. His admonition to the philosopher who must return to the cave to enlighten his fellowmen, points to Plato's strong belief that philosophizing is not merely an intellectual matter and, there is a duty, to share learning with other men. This attitude has tremendous potential in the ideal educational perspective. Plato proposed the kind of education that would move man and society toward the Good. In essence, he suggested the state must take a very active role in educational matters and must offer a curriculum which ascends from a concern with concrete data toward abstract thinking. Accordingly, those who showed little ability for abstractions would go into pursuit that would assist in the practical realities of running the society (industry, business, etc.) whereas those who were proficient in the dialectic would continue their education and become philosophers. Most interesting too was that Plato believed that philosophers must rule the state so that wisdom pervades every aspect of state life.

Even in the modern world Plato's ideas have stimulated a

great deal of thinking about purpose of education. His views have influenced modern thinking particularly in the area of women's education. Plato believed that both, boys and girls should be given an equal opportunity in education and he championed the cause that women should occupy equal positions in the state. The hallmark of all modern educational policies in the world today is the equal opportunity offered irrespective of gender.

Judaism, a precursor of Christianity, contained many beliefs compatible with idealism and came to be referred as religious idealism. The ideas of one God and the Universal Good is compatible with idealism. Idealism exerted a great amount of influence on Christianity, also, through the Greek influence, on the writers of the New Testament.<sup>4</sup>

The founders of the Roman Catholic Church were also influenced by idealism. One can find allusions to Greek philosophy in all the writings of Saint Augustine.<sup>5</sup> Whereas Plato divided the world of matter from that of ideas, Augustine described the concept as the World of God and the World of Man. He believed that man could transcend the world of man through faith and meditation. The essence of his teachings was that man can discover knowledge through trying to find God, and that he must look within his soul for the true knowledge that exists there.

In the educational field, he therefore 'promoted' an intuitive approach to education and argued that physical phenomena could lead us away from the path of true knowledge. Augustine held that the ability to make judgements is innate and that a teacher can only help the student and make him see for himself What he already knew without being aware of it. His famous examples of these intuitive judgements are the propositions of mathematics and the appreciation of moral values - which are not constructions of the individual mind since when correctly formulated these are accepted by all minds alike.

In the Christian interpretation, the individual thinker does not make the truth - he finds it and he is able to do so because the revealing 'word of God is the inward teacher who enables him to see the truth for himself when he listens to him.

This too was Plato's view, and like Plato, Augustine also believed in the use of the dialectical method of learning to facilitate discovering true ideas about God and man. The Platonic idea that true reality is basically idea is quite similar to the Christian concept that God created the world out of Himself.

Religious idealism exerted tremendous influence on

education (and this was strengthened with the realization that Christianity would propagate better if its adherents were given systematic education) and those educated were indoctrinated with the idealist point of view. In Christianity the ultimate reality is God and the bridge to it is the Soul. (just as to Plato the ultimate is idea and the bridge to it is the mind).

Modern Idealism developed with the advent of the scientific revolution when idealism became identified with systematization. It can readily be seen that Descartes' principle of finite mind contemplating objects of thought founded in God, is in the tradition of idealism rather than traditional rationalism. His method of arriving at principles through the method of analysis is what brought new life into philosophy. This has tremendous input in the educative process especially in 'problem solving' methodology. Efforts like those of Berkeley<sup>6</sup> may be viewed as a kind of last ditch stand against the encroachment of science and even Hume indicated an acceptance of Berkelean ideas which have influenced scholars in many fields to study the nature of perception.

Kant rejected Berkeley's position that things are totally dependent on mind, as this notion would reject the possibility of scientific law. Kant's effort was to arrive

at universal postulations concerning what we may call moral ideals, imperatives or moral laws. This effort permeates Kant's<sup>7</sup> writings on education, a matter he considered to be of primary importance. One of his categorical imperatives was that each person be treated as an end and never as a mere means. This has influenced subsequent thought about the importance of character development in education.

According to him, education was not only to equip one for the present, but for the possibility of an improved future condition called 'the whole destiny of mankind'. To Kant the essence of education was 'enlightenment' or teaching a child to think according to principles, as opposed to mere random behaviour. This is closely associated to his notion of 'will'. The education of 'will' means living according to the duties flowing from the categorical imperatives.<sup>8</sup> Kant examines education in his historically influential work entitled Education. He examines the process of education as both a theoretical and practical endeavour. This work effectively influences many aspects of education ranging from discipline to curriculum. Kant thus remains an inexhaustible source of ideas in education, comparable in this respect to Plato and Aristotle. He thought that an important part of the child's education was performing duties towards himself and others. Kant explored the moral and ethical realm primarily in 'Critique of Practical

Reason'. His effort was to arrive at universal postulations concerning what we may call moral ideals, moral imperatives or moral laws. This aspect of Kant's thinking was not tied to nature, hence it may be called his 'Spiritual' side. Much to Kant's efforts were directed to show that real knowledge is possible. His efforts at this were diluted by the uneasy manner in which he united apparently opposing themes, such as phenomenon and noumenon, the pure and the practical; and subjectivity and objectivity. The two 'Critiques' illustrate this conflict for one speaks to the logic of thought, and the other, to its practical applications. In the 'Critique of Pure Reason' Kant found it impossible to make absolutely universal and necessary judgements about human experience based on rational & Scientific grounds. In 'Critique of Practical Reason'<sup>9</sup> he thought such judgements could be made. Thus his moral laws which he called 'categorical imperatives' strongly emphasized his educational ideas. The striking characteristic of Hegel's philosophy in his logic, identified with his 'dialectic', which has been portrayed as a mechanical warring between thesis and antithesis, the result being a synthesis. Hegel believed that in order to be truly educated an individual must pass through the various stages of the cultural evolution of mankind implying that individuals benefit from all that has gone before them. This can be explained thus - a

contemporary person can learn an aspect of our cultural development (electronics) as compared to an individual who lived a hundred years ago. Hegel thought it was possible for at least some individuals to know everything essential in the history of man's collective consciousness. Because of the present 'knowledge explosion' such an educational idea is preposterous. But to some extent Hegel may be right as there is a need to pass on the cultural heritage from the past to the present. This is not a practical idea in educational practice, and even to Hegel the attainment of such encyclopedic knowledge was an ideal<sup>10</sup> and rested possibly only with a few and with the elite. In the modern concept of education where the instructional programmes have to be gratified this becomes an impossible task. There is a radical difference here from Krishnamurti's views who points out that if the mind approaches the timeless, not only that it does not and cannot grasp it, but it reduces eternity to continuity in time. Consider his statement: "Thought 'can only free itself from the opposites, from duality, when it is not caught up in them and is capable of understanding 'what is' without the reaction of the opposite".<sup>11</sup> Thus, thought which is the content of consciousness, cannot be destroyed, but it can be freed from the network of identification. Thought then recedes as factual memory into consciousness. Krishnamurti on the other hand is concerned with the clearing of

psychological memory from the consciousness so that intelligence can operate.

Due to the knowledge explosion today Hegel's educational ideal seems naive, but the ideas are still valid as there is a need to pass on the cultural heritage to the present. The aims of Idealist education are the search for truth, self realization and character development. Idealism has always stressed the importance of mind over matter, and the stress is less on the study of physical and concrete areas and more on the non physical and the abstract. The important thing for the idealist is to arrive at truth. Hence the study of any major work in art or science lies in its carrying us to a higher point in our thinking, in providing insight into our selves and the universe of which we are a part.

Self realization is a central aim of idealist education, but not in isolation and only in the larger context of nature. The contemporary educator Donald Butler,<sup>12</sup> in his analysis in "Idealism in Education", states that the concern for the individual is one of the primary characteristics that make idealism still viable to the modern man. In his analysis he indicates that 'self' lies at the centre of idealistic metaphysics (science of idealistic education!). Thus the self is the prime reality

of individual experience; that ultimate reality may be conceived as a self and that it may be one self, a community of selves, or a Universal Self. Consequently, education becomes primarily concerned with self realization. Since thinking and knowing are central in educational concerns it is little wonder that idealism has exerted much influence on educational views about individual mind and self.

Another important idea is the relation of the part to the whole or self to society. In the modern era this theme was more developed by Hegel.<sup>13</sup> He stated that the individual must be related to the whole, for it is only in the setting of the total relationship that the real significance of a single individual can be found. Hegel would even go so far as to say that one must relate himself to the total existence, the cosmos, in order to gain true understanding of himself.

Krishnamurti also points out that the conditioned mind cannot probably conceive the unconditioned, all it can do is <sup>to</sup> impose its limitations on it. The point here is that the whole cannot be understood from the part, as Krishnamurti states: "How can you understand the whole when you are worshiping the part? Being petty, partial, limited, how can you understand that which is boundless,

infinite? The small can cease to be. In understanding what makes for limitations, for partiality, and transcending it, you will be able to comprehend the whole,  
14  
the limitless.

The idealist approach gives importance to the more philosophically oriented teachers who will infuse the students with a desire to improve their thinking as they believe that a good education would make character development its foremost goal. The student is seen as having enormous potential for growth, both moral and cognitive. The teacher, therefore, from the idealist perspective is in an unique position to guide the students and to provide a suitable environment for their development. Most idealists have a deep feeling about the inner powers of an individual such as intuition, that must be accounted for in any true education.

Much of the educational practice is feeding a person intellectually rather than bringing out the truths that already exists. Education is the process of bringing these truths to the surface and the dialectic is the tool for regaining this lost wisdom. Education can be conceived as not only consisting of the dialectic but also the technique of meditation to bring out truths already possessed by the soul. Krishnamurti also emphasized on meditation but not

as the cultivation of a habit of concentrating on an idea since habit soon degenerates into the mechanical activity of the mind. To Krishnamurti, meditation is a process of self discovery, an all inclusive awareness of 'what is', Effortless living is living in meditation.

Idealists do not favour specialized learning as much as learning that is holistic. The direction is towards seeing the whole rather than a disjointed collection of parts. The holistic approach leads to a more liberal attitude towards learning. Here again we draw a similarity with the ideas of Krishnamurti regarding a wholistic approach in learning. "Meditation implies the whole life, not just the technical, monastic, or scholastic life, but total life and to apprehend and communicate this totality, there must be a certain seeing of it without space and time. A mind must have in itself a sense of the spaceless and the timeless state. It must see the whole of this picture. How will you approach it and help the student to see the whole of life, not in little segments, but life in its totality ...  
15  
comprehend the enormity of this".

Some idealists maintain that truth is also received through intuition and revelation. Self realization is an important aim of idealistic education. In essence the idealist believes that true education occurs only within the

individual self.

No other single philosophy has affected education for as great a period of time as idealism. Industrialization and technological advances are some of the factors which have weakened idealism in contemporary affairs. Opponents of idealism have long searched for ways to get around, what to them is the lethargic nature of idealism. Einstein's theory of relativity has been used to challenge the idealist assertion of a fixed universe.

While idealistic education has emphasized the cognitive side of man, it has tended toward intellectualism to the detriment of the affective and physical side. It has also ignored the large number of individuals who find its cognitive emphasis narrow and pedantic resulting in an intellectual elite, available only to a privileged few. The idealist curriculum being overly bookish fails to recognize emotional and social needs thereby attending to the complete person. Idealists claim to be holistic and universal yet in their extreme cognitive and bookish approach they seem to fail in this aspect.

Another criticism levelled at idealism is that it deals too much with the past and too little with the present and the future. It is true that great ideas from the past should

be studied, but contemporary ideas and writings cannot be ignored.

One of the claims made by the idealists is that they pay great attention to the development of character. But, what parades for character development is conformity and subservience on the part of the learner which may assist in educational and social stability, often at the expense of creativity and self direction. Krishnamurti brings to sharp focus the perils of conformity, when he says: "conformity is gratifying; it assures security to the disciple, and gives power to the disciple as well as to the teacher, through conformity there is the strengthening of authority, secular or religious; and conformity makes for dullness, which they call peace. If one wants to avoid suffering through some form of resistance, why not pursue that path, though it involves a certain amount of pain? Conformity anesthetizes the mind to conflict, we want to be made dull, insensitive; we try to shut off the ugly and thereby we also make ourselves dull to the beautiful. Conformity to the authority of the dead or the living gives intense satisfaction. The teacher knows and you don't know. It would be foolish for you to try to find out anything for yourself when your comforting teacher already knows; so you become his slave, and slavery is better than confusion. The teacher and the disciple thrive on mutual

16  
exploitation".

The philosophy of idealism has many shades and meanings and each philosopher and educationist reinterprets these ideas in the light of different experiences and in the social, cultural and political context of a particular era.

? Realism reflects the idealist notion that only ideas are real. In one sense, for the realist, matter is real i.e. matter is an obvious example of an independent reality. Aristotle developed the view that while ideas may be important in themselves, a proper study of matter could lead us to better and more distinct ideas. According to him each piece of matter has both, a universal and a particular property. Therefore although 'people' differ in all aspects i.e. there are no two people exactly alike, yet all people do share in something universal, and this could be called their humanness. Aristotle<sup>17</sup> thought that the primary aim of education should be to produce a virtuous person and believed that education should not be restricted to the school room but was a function of the State as well. From his chief mentor, Plato, he reinterpreted humanness. Humanness is a reality and exists independently of any one particular human. He further argued that the universal properties remain constant i.e. even if all men should die, humanness would remain. Aristotle's educational writings

have a significant impact on modern education and his thought has greatly influenced our conceptions of education in the humanities and the sciences. In the same direction the modern philosopher Henri Bergson<sup>18</sup> spoke about an elan vital, or vital principle that each object has and that directs it in terms of fulfilling its purpose. Balance is central to Aristotle's view and he saw all the universe in some balanced fashion. The chief good for Aristotle is happiness. Happiness depends on a virtuous soul and this can only come about as we develop habits of virtue that are shaped through proper education. The Aristotelian influence includes the need to study nature systematically, using logical processes in thought and emphasizing the rational aspects of human nature.

Realism is, needless to say, a confusing philosophy since there are different aspects to it i.e. classical realism, religious realism, scientific realism, natural realism and rational realism. This confusion stems from Aristotle himself, for although his ideas were derived from his differences with Platonic philosophy, yet there are more similarities overall than differences between Plato and Aristotle. The 'primary confusion over realism may be between a religious realism and a secular or scientific realism. While religious realism would show the similarities of Aristotle's philosophy to Plato and Thomas

Aquinas, Secular realism would relate Aristotle's work more to the development of scientific philosophy (inductive thinking).

Because of the confusing array of variations, the most sensible path to take is from the common elements that are interwoven throughout its long history.

Aristotle's ideas influenced the Christian religion and encouraged secularism. Aquinas became an authority on Aristotle and found no conflict between Aristotle's ideas and those of the church. His views on education are that one should proceed from the study of matter to the study of form. He believed that proper education recognizes the spiritual and material nature of man. One of the main problems of classical realism was its failure to develop a good method of inductive thinking and they were still caught in a deductive style of thinking.

Modern realism developed out of attempts to correct this and these corrective attempts were at the heart of what we today call the 'scientific revolution'. Francis Bacon and John Locke<sup>20</sup> were the most outstanding realist thinkers engaged in this effort.

Locke did not overly concern with the nature of mind itself

but concentrated on how knowledge is gained by mind. He was an empiricist and respected the concrete and practical. Locke's views on education are not theoretical but practical on all general topics of education.

Most outstanding in contemporary realism was Bertrand Russell<sup>21</sup> who was greatly interested in education. He went toward mathematical quantification and verification as the basis of philosophical generalization. Russell tried to put his educational ideas to work at the school he founded called Beacon Hill. He thought of education as a key to a better world by the eradication of poverty and ignorance.

Realists agree that education should have as its aims the essentials and the practical. The essentials and the practicalities of education lead to something beyond themselves, an element that is distinctly Aristotelian, that is, it proceeds from matter to form, from imperfection to perfection. Realists are Aristotelian in viewing education as the process of developing our rational powers to the fullest and to achieve life's goals. The Realist places enormous emphasis upon critical reason aided by experimentation and observation. The schools should teach such fundamental facts about the universe and a good school programme will present material in interesting and enjoyable ways.

As a forerunner of much in modern educational theory Locke recognized that a child should not be pushed beyond his ability and readiness to learn. This is very scientific and contemporary. The critics point out that in practice, realism is rigid, incorporating practices such as Herbart's 'five formal steps of learning' (preparation, presentation, association, systematization and generalization) the desire for order and precision such as set-time periods, course scheduling, preplanned curriculum are carefully executed.

Herbart J.F. was another realist educator strongly influenced by Pestalozzi. He criticized what he characterized as the atomistic curriculum of his day. He felt that there should be a system of correlation and concentration whereby each subject would bear upon, and be integrated with, other related subjects. Teaching he believed should be multilateral, <sup>for</sup> example, Geography, economics and history should be taught together so that the student can see relationships that provide the basis for new knowledge. Herbart believed that ideas are kept alive through interest and the main function of education is to see that ideas are retained in the mind through books, lectures and other teaching devices.

Krishnamurti's idea of school activity is a direct contrast in the sense of its flexibility and non-rigidity arising

out of his views on the dangers of imposed external discipline.

As Krishnamurti says: "Discipline is a process of condemnation, comparison or justification".<sup>22</sup> Critics point out that students come to be seen in terms of subservience to a superior entity such as a curriculum or standards of excellence.

The emphasis on discipline, includes a disciplined approach to subject matter learning and life activities.

The antecedents of PRAGMATISM are varied but the basic elements which are of importance are induction, the importance of human experience, naturalistic humanism and the relations between science and the culture of man. Pragmatism is a philosophy that seeks out processes that work best to achieve desirable goals. It reviews traditional ways of thinking and doing, and reconstructs the approach to life according to the present day needs. The philosophical elements that give pragmatism a consistency as a philosophy in its own right are the contributions of Pierce<sup>23</sup> and John Dewey.

Francis Bacon's influence on pragmatism has been significant. The method of induction suggested by him is

the basis for scientific thinking. Induction allowed the experimental approach to influence every aspect of human life i.e. it put a premium on human experience. John Dewey<sup>24</sup> in 'How we think' put forward the method of scientific thinking in the centre of the educative process.

Dewey applied the meaning of induction to education and society. John Locke<sup>25</sup> emphasized the importance of placing children in a most conducive environment for their education. Locke emphasized on the importance of experience and its relation to thought processes and personal development. According to Locke the mind is a 'tabula rasa' receiving impressions through the senses. Charles Pierce came out with the counter statement that ideas are not to be perceived as isolated impressions on a blank mind but as interrelated parts of experience.

Dewey found Locke's view of the mind as 'tabula rasa' to be too passive and pointed out the mind to be an active agent in the formulation of ideas. He also emphasized on the transactional character of the relations between man and the environment. He also maintained that individuals cannot live in isolation from social forces, and it is the cognizance that he gave to social forces that made him believe that education was for social adjustment. Back

into history, the views of Jean Jacques Rousseau had tremendous import for pragmatic theory. His proposals for education are found in 'Emile'<sup>26</sup> where he takes a child away from civilization and brings him up in the country, where he lives naturally and learns from nature while ignoring books altogether until Emile reaches the age of twelve. Of Sophie, Emile's counterpart, her education would (only!) complement Emile's. Rousseau's major contribution to education is the way in which he connected nature and experience, and the child's development is seen as going through certain stages. Rousseau helped educators focus on the physiological, psychological and social developmental stages of childhood. (Pedagogist M. Montessori was influenced by this view). M. Montessori promoted both interest and the use of objects in the educational process. In the Montessori method therefore there are all sorts of experiences with blocks, cylinders and geometric patterns as these assist in the cognitive development of the child as well as his physical development. He thus set the stage for child centred education. Rousseau believed that education should be guided by the child's interest i.e. his native tendency to find out about the world he lives in. He believed in the child's autonomy, and considered it a natural autonomy where the child has to suffer the natural consequences of his action. Krishnamurti's idea of discipline is the

discipline born out of self knowledge and understanding. This is the highest form of discipline. "This discipline", in his own words, "is not an external compulsion, or something you impose on yourself, as an inward demand, to follow, to obey, but rather the act of learning about anything is discipline itself".<sup>27</sup>

<sup>28</sup>  
A.S. Neill's "Summerhill" strongly reflects Rousseau's influence and it advocates freedom but not license (i.e. uninhibited permissiveness). Dewey pointed out that 'philosophy of education' is the formation of right mental and moral attitudes to face up to contemporary situations. Dewey as well as most other pragmatic educators prefer methods that are flexible. Furthermore knowledge must be related by developing a core approach to curriculum. The motivation factor has to be duly considered in group work or individual projects. The pragmatists are for action oriented education and problem solving abilities, and they endorse a more general education as opposed to narrow specialization. Dewey considers education by its very nature an experimental proposition where there are no fixed or absolute conclusions.

It is difficult to separate a philosophy from the prevailing culture. Dewey's philosophy for example called for a rigorous attention to consequences in terms of moral

and social goods and not in the crass material terms of modern society. The critique of progressivism alleged lack of patriotic and religious fervour, and excessive freedom and lack of discipline. One of the critics against pragmatism is that it deprecates acquisition of knowledge and cognitive development. Since studies are organized around student interest, the result is that students lack the discipline that comes from studies in the basic subject areas. Consequently students are short changed in terms of knowledge and lax in terms of discipline.

Many factors account for much of the difficulty found in pragmatism. For one, Dewey's style of writing which lends itself to misrepresentation; the breadth and the lack of analytic specificity in pragmatic philosophy, and, the pragmatic penchant for focussing on specific problems. Pragmatic philosophy, for all its problems, has been one of the enduring contributions to education.

The PROGRESSIVIST approach to education like pragmatism, entails the practical features of life and considers education as an useful form of social life. Progressivists emphasize 'problem solving' in education since it is a learned activity and therefore makes one best equipped to face life's challenges. An interdisciplinary approach in education is also emphasized and 'learning by doing'

stresses the importance of the role of the learner in the learning process. Progressivists think that learning should involve a cooperative interchange between school and society. Krishnamurti has a clear distinction between working together along the lines of established authority, under the stimulus of authority, and cooperation which comes from seeing the truth and the necessity of putting that truth into action: "Since he believes that it is only when each one of us understand the truth of any issue, then our common understanding of that truth leads to action, and such action is cooperation".<sup>29</sup> In the educational setting Krishnamurti points out that co-operation between the educator and the student is the responsibility of both and he says that "the word cooperation implies working together, and we cannot work together if we are not looking in the same direction with the same eyes and the same mind".<sup>30</sup>

Krishnamurti believed that classroom instruction must arise out of a flexible curriculum without rigorous evaluation measurements since he believed that each child should be free to perform at his optimum level of performance and be free of competition and grading pressures.

The philosophy of RECONSTRUCTIONISM contains 2 main situations: that society is in need of constant

reconstruction and that such social change involves both, a construction of education and the use of education in reconstructing society.

Reconstructionistic ideas in education have existed in one form or another throughout history. Plato in redesigning for a future state, <sup>31</sup> The Republic, was a reconstructionist philosopher on all counts. Among the Christian philosophers, Augustine preached reconstructionist reform in order to bring about an ideal Christian State. <sup>32</sup> The reforms that Augustine suggested in 'The City of God' were intended for man's soul rather than his material being but had ramifications that were interpreted by the material world as well.

<sup>33</sup>  
Karl Marx pictured a reconstructed Society based upon an international communism. He believed that education should not be any ivory tower affair but a method of changing the world, and, place the proletariat in control. To do this would mean overthrowing the present economic system and instituting a new kind of education directed toward raising social consciousness of economic controls, that would enable each person to be an end and not a means.

Due to World Wars, Optimism in the future of the world was dramatically changed and surfaced such 'dysutopias' as

34

35

Aldous Huxley's 'Brave New World' and George Orwell's '1984', while at the same time reformers such as Bertrand Russell in 'Principles of Social Reconstruction',<sup>36</sup> listed ways that man might take in order to avoid a nuclear holocaust. The present day educational reforms are directed to change the world and eliminate war, racism and poverty as well as to make significant changes in daily life, due to technological advance, through the use of 'behavioural engineering'.<sup>37</sup> B.F. Skinner in 'Waldon Two' recommends engineering a new social order based on the engineering of behaviour. A more detailed aspect of behavioural engineering is discussed later in this chapter under the theory of Behaviourism.

Reconstructionism is not a philosophy in the more traditional sense of the word, in that it does not seek to make detailed epistemological studies but is more concerned with the broad social and cultural fabric in which we exist. Hence it is more a social philosophy whose leading exponents are educationists and social activists.

38

Theodore Brameld has come closest to the traditional role of the philosopher and wrote extensively about the philosophical nature of reconstructionism. He sees reconstructionism as a philosophy of values, ends and purposes. One finds in him an inclination toward

futuristic thinking in reconstructionist philosophy since reconstructionists have a penchant for Utopian thinking that leads to the attainment of an ideal world. Reconstructionists believe that planning about the future and providing alternative societies should be encouraged in schools where students can become future oriented. Alvin Toffler<sup>39</sup> points out in Future Shock that individuals have to face too many changes in too short a period of time and to combat future shock, Toffler suggested 'future studies' as part of the curriculum at every level of schooling. This curriculum could be realised through activities such as role playing, computer programmes of 'future games' and 'future fairs'. Reconstructionists feel that educational programmes should orient students toward becoming 'agents of change'. Educators are now aware that they are educating students who must function as productive citizens many years after their days in the classroom. It was in this connection that Dewey pointed out to the facts that what we teach today may be out of date by the time the student graduates and has to perform as a productive citizen. It was this that led him to emphasize on the 'problem-solving' method in education as it would relate to the student in the present as well as in the future.

The most important direction that reconstructionists take is the view that modern man is facing a crisis of survival

and that the school occupies a strategic position in meeting the crisis and providing a necessary foundation for action.

Reconstructionists believe their approach is a radical departure from pragmatism and critics have attacked charging that the reconstructionist analysis of social problems and their strong desire for change, are prescriptions for reform. Their view of democracy and decision making is different from Dewey's conception of open-endedness and the intimate relation between means and ends.

EXISTENTIALISM is one of the recent trends in philosophy traced to the 19th century to Soren Kierkegaard,<sup>40</sup> Nietzsche,<sup>41</sup> Martin Buber (the Israeli philosopher - theologian) and, Jean Paul Sartre,<sup>42</sup> author of Existentialism and Human Emotions. Existentialism has only recent application to educational theory and due to the very nature of its credo - the lonely, estranged and alienated individual caught up in an absurd world - makes it difficult to sort out a consistent meaning of it.

Kierkegaard argued for the subjective individual who makes his choices against an objective and science oriented world. He believed that education should be subjective and

devoted to the development of the individual. The humanism of Martin Bauber has a profound impact on education. He was one of the few existentialists who wrote specifically about education, especially the Teacher-Student relationship. What he really advocated was the kind of education where the teacher and student, while differing in kinds and amount of knowledge were on equal ground in terms of humanity; and each one in this relationship is both teacher and learner at the same time. He believed that the most desirable educational situation is one where friendship - the epitome of an 'I-thou' relationship - can exist. He was careful to point out that education could also consist of an 'I - It' relationship in which the student is treated as an object.

Krishnamurti has a marked similarity with this framé of thought. There is a departure in Krishnamurti's teachings from the traditional setting which is hierarchical of the relationship between the teacher and the taught, the 'guru' and the 'shishya'. To Krishnamurti, the teacher and the student function at the same level communicating through questioning and counter questioning till the depths of the problem are discussed and understanding is revealed, enlightening the mind of both the teacher and the taught.

Existentialists have a great concern for the role of the

individual in life and their view that the individual first exists and then defines his purpose, arises from the belief that it is from individuals that all ideas, values and institutions come forth. This is radically different from the idealist view where all ideas are real, pre-existing and independent from man. For the idealist, the individual discovers ideas whereas for the existentialist, the individual creates them. Existentialists are firm believers in commitment and action and believe that both work together. Existentialism is not systematic in the traditional sense but it does have a strong stand as a philosophy (in the tradition of Socrates Just as Socrates was the gadfly of ancient times pricking the consciences of the Athenians, the existentialists also urge us to examine our lives and break away from superficiality and uncommitted action. Krishnamurti also suggests the method of introspection as a guide to self-knowledge. Sartre tells us that 'existence precedes essence' (i.e. first comes the individual and then the ideas that he creates). Education must thus focus on individual human reality and recognize that the individual besides being a cognitive being is also an emotional being. The emotional existentialist view is one in which our highest concepts are put into practice, not only in personal life, but in the world at large. Existentialists condemn the school as a dehumanizing force that indoctrinates the individual and

steals personal initiative. Students and teachers are both victims of these circumstances and so long as the educational institutions are pitched against individual identity, personality, and well being, modern society cannot hope to find its bearings against the technological advancements.

Existentialist ideas of education do not infer that individuals cannot learn from others, benefit from discipline, or cannot gain from formal education. Important in the modern context is the new avenues in education opened up by the existential view especially in the field of 'alternative education'.

Existentialists are seeking to open our awareness to human potential and human possibilities in the modern world.

Krishnamurti seems to crystallize the essence of this thought when he poignantly questions our educational perspective: "Are we only educators or are we human beings who see education as a significant and true way of helping human beings to cultivate the total mind?"<sup>43</sup>

The implications of existentialist formulations for education are many since existentialists behold human life as unique and emerging and believe that the child is to be

recognized as a full person and not simply as an incomplete adult.

Educational standards and practices that manipulate the child's behaviours in an arbitrary manner violate the principle of free choice. According to existentialists, over-structured school systems enslave rather than liberate young souls; and bureaucratization needs to be replaced by humanization. From the existential point of view, many teaching practices, testing procedures and bureaucratic systems of classifying children may be questioned. Such institutions do not serve a truly educational purpose, producing efficient robots rather than inspired, enlightened and creative individuals.

On the other hand, teachers who have learned to provide existential encounters for their students enable the learners 'to create meanings in a cosmos devoid of objective meaning, to find reasons for being in a society with fewer and fewer open doors'. If the purpose of education is to build character, to optimize potential and creativity and to enhance the quality of life through knowledge, then from an existentialists perspectives bureaucratization needs to be replaced by humanization.

In Krishnamurti's view, for the teacher to perform his

role, it is first and foremost important that he perceives his "total responsibility in his personal relationship not only to student but to the whole of mankind"<sup>44</sup>. According to Krishnamurti, "responsibility is for the whole, as the word implies, not for one self, not for one's family, not for some concepts or beliefs, but for the whole of mankind."<sup>45</sup> For Krishnamurti the human being "psychologically is the whole of mankind ... the whole psyche of mankind ... psychologically, inwardly, one is like another human being ... So psychologically you are the world; you are responsible for the whole of mankind, not for yourself as a separate human being, which is a psychological illusion."<sup>46</sup> In the educational perspective therefore the teacher should feel complete responsibility for the student.

In the realm of counseling, existential intervention is conceptualized as a "conscious attitudinal perspective toward rebuilding the impaired self"<sup>47</sup>. The existential influences on counseling practices (in schools) have been quite far reaching and some form of existential intervention is employed by those counselors using Gestalt therapy, and, communication and cognitive approaches.

Human development is seen by existentialists as independent of external forces but as something which is guided by the

creative forces of the integral self. In other words, development is a self directed synthesis of self destined energy and potential. The individual has freedom of choice, which in educational terms implies a capacity to change. It is a freedom that helps with the self emerging process.

Sec 76 | Krishnamurti clearly holds that the individual is responsible for his actions and for the world that he creates around himself. His radically different view is that he believes the individual is responsible to himself and to no one else, and that is the proof of the freedom of the individual. If man is responsible to an external authority, Krishnamurti believes that true sense of responsibility, like true faith should come from within the individual, out of love for life, out of the understanding of the wholeness of life, out of freedom from the illusion of the ego. Man is free to liberate life within him, or to remain in bondage. Krishnamurti maintains that man is potentially free, but is in effect limited by his inability to differentiate the eternal from the transient - hence these limitations are self imposed and self sustained. Hence man is in bondage because he is free to delimit himself. The following extract from his talk explains his trend of thought: "... man, the individual is absolutely free, that he is entirely and wholly master of

circumstances. Being free he is thereby limited. Because your freedom is in the capacity to choose, to discriminate, between right and wrong, beautiful and ugly, you are necessarily limited by your capacity... By the breaking down of this limitation, through the natural growth of experience, you become free of limitation and thereby become the highest, the perfect, the consummate human being ... " <sup>48</sup> Thus, though man is free, he has to evolve to the highest degree of intelligence, so that he may realise that freedom.

Marxism is a comprehensive political system and the Marxists believe that education is shaped by economic change and in turn helps to create new changes. Like the Marxists, Krishnamurti also believes that much of what passes for present education is really indoctrination to enslave the masses to existing economic, political and social systems. The hidden curriculum teaches docility and subservience to the present system. The Marxists believe that such education must be eradicated if we are to prevent exploitation and move toward a world of economic and social justice. Krishnamurti affirms with this view and points out that in order to do this, students must be exposed to new and radical views and they must be encouraged to become agents for change in building a better society.

BEHAVIOURISM is not generally considered a philosophy in the same sense as idealism or in the way other such thought systems are. It is classified as a psychological theory and given increasing attention and acceptance in the field of education. It is in many ways projected into the domain of philosophy especially in theoretical considerations dealing with the nature of man and society, values and speculation on the nature of reality.

The interrelationship between a psychological theory and philosophical assumptions and implications cannot be under emphasized, and behaviourism, even though it has a clear scientific orientation is no less involved in the philosophical perspective as other psychological theories. Behaviourism has its foundations in the realists theory of independent reality and the behaviourists believe that behaviour is caused by environmental factors. This is another realist inclination toward the importance of the discernible, factual, observable aspects of the universe. Therefore by understanding certain behaviours and how these are the result of environmental factors, the processes by which behaviour comes about and thereby exercise control over human behaviour, can be understood, making it possible to engineer more effectively the kinds of people and social conditions in the modern world.

Fundamentally, materialism is the theory that reality can be explained by the laws of matter and motion. Behaviourism is a kind of materialism if man is viewed in terms of his biological content. The behaviourists believe that body is material and behaviour is a motion. Thus man can be studied from the aspect of matter and motion. For the behaviourists man is not endowed with any super-natural quality, but rather he is part of nature and is governed by instinct. Ivan Pavlov (1849-1936) who was noted for his studies in reflex reaction was also the proponent of the conditioning theory wherein he showed how both, realism and materialism are related. For Pavlov's dog the response is not based on a mental process but it is based on conditioning which can be explained by external factors.

While modern behaviourists use operant conditioning that includes action on the part of the organism being conditioned, Pavlov only considered conditioned reflex behaviour. In operant conditioning, the organism can act to alter the environment and the resultant change reinforces the behaviour pattern i.e. there is a two way flow. In education this is explained in the rewards and punishments meted out to students. Positive reinforcers spurt students to better achievements and negative reinforcers are detrimental to educational achievement.

J.B. Watson<sup>49</sup> relied solely on observational technique restricted to behaviour. For instance, he stated that the fears people have are conditioned responses to the environment. He conditioned people to be fearful and then reconditioned them. He thought of the environment as the primary influence on behaviour and maintained that if he could control a child's environment he could then engineer the child into any kind of person desired. In rejecting mentalistic functions of mind and consciousness, he also gave no importance to such concepts as feeling, satisfaction, purpose and free-will which are not observable and therefore not capable of scientific measurement.

B.F. Skinner<sup>50</sup> maintains that although the traditional view is that the autonomous man perceives the world in order to interpret it (i.e action comes from the autonomous man to the environment), the reverse is the case. According to him 'knowing' is really a case of environment acting on us. We perceive and know to the extent that we respond to stimuli from environmental contingencies. Accordingly to Skinner, 'knowing' is not a cognitive process, but it is behavioural and environmental, neurological and even physiological. On the other hand, for Skinner, knowing ones desires, beliefs and feelings is more difficult due to the lack of verbal tools to accomplish these without

verbalization in some form, behaviour is, for the most part, unconsciousness. According to Skinner, consciousness in the verbal awareness sense is a social product. Really knowing the inner realm proves difficult due to the lack of proper verbalization of it. The tendency is to leave it to our conviction of an autonomous presence. Unless the contingencies of reinforcement are properly uncovered this personal awareness cannot be described.

Skinner affirms that when and if we really come to know this personal awareness, it will not be different from external objects, viz the content of the knowledge will be only that which is observable. In Skinnerian terms, this is knowledge of behaviour and contingencies of reinforcement, and not anything like soul or inner man. Skinner's critics say that he is 'abolishing' man which according to Skinner, is only the autonomous man, the 'inner man', and what is left is the real observable human organism purely biological and a complex system behaving according to the laws of nature and capable of being observed.

The closest one gets to Skinner's views is that one is both controller as well as the controlled. What it actually means is that we are our own makers - that is, we have developed through two processes<sup>es</sup> of evolution. One process is

the biological process from which we evolved, and the second is the cultural process of evolution that we have largely created. The second process has significant importance to Skinner who says that environment today is contrived and therefore not natural and it is an environment that we have created. This environment, according to Skinner, contains the significant contingencies of reinforcement that finally go to make us human. Hence we are our own makers, and while we are doing the making, we are being made (i.e. we are the result of that conditioning). Skinner advocates control and thinks that a new society can be shaped through control. This means someone must be in charge to make sure that control is exercised efficiently towards the highest aims we can establish.

For Skinner, the social environment is culture (and not values and ideas which transform and change a culture). Skinner maintains that controls are needed to make us more sensitive to the consequences of our behaviour. Reinforcement follows behaviour and does not precede it and it develops in directions that are positively reinforced. Thus we should be controlling and using contingencies that reinforce desired behaviours.

According to Skinner, good education must motivate students

to progress and there must be immediate reinforcement. When a child takes a test for example, it is important to let him know immediately whether the responses are right or wrong. The interest of the child to know the responses is very sharp immediately after the test. If the child is given results a week later there is a marked fall in interest, Skinner maintains. Therefore the child should know immediately when he is right or wrong. This is the main reason why he championed such methods of immediate reinforcement as 'programmed learning' and 'teaching machines' in educational practice. Skinner always advocates positive reinforcements.

Skinner states that the educational institutions cannot educate effective citizens who will build a good society, but he foresees the possibility of developing better ways. According to him, change of culture or individuals can come about through the change of behaviour; and the way to change the behaviour is to change the contingencies, that is, culture or social environment. Contingencies are the conditions in which behaviour occurs, reinforcing and influencing the direction and quality of behaviour.

Krishnamurti talks about bringing about the change in society from a radically different perspective. For Krishnamurti, man and society are interrelated; "The Social

pattern is set up by man; it is not independent of man, though it has a life of its own and man is not independent of it. They are interrelated. Change within the pattern is no change at all; it is mere modification, reformation".<sup>51</sup>

Krishnamurti begins with the preposition that all societies, even the most utopian, have within their structure the seeds of their own corruption, which leads it to its own deterioration. As he puts it: "Only by breaking away from the social pattern without building another can you help society. As long as you belong to society, you are only helping it to deteriorate. All societies, including the most marvelously utopian, have within them the seeds of their own corruption. To change society, you must break away from it. You must cease to be what society is: acquisitive, ambitious, envious, power seeking ..."<sup>52</sup>

Skinner views the educational process as one of the main ways of designing a culture through positive reinforcements.

Skinner is a strong advocate of education, although many critics argue that education for him means training. Children seem to respond to a method that provides both incentives and rewards for their achievement.

Behaviourists suggest the use of behavioural engineering methods in education as well as in social life. Skinner has, for example, taken the possibilities of his theories into the area of social and cultural reform. The main criticism of Skinner's theory is his views on man as being devoid of inherent freedom and dignity. Behavioural techniques while successful at the experimentation level, may not be applicable to society in general where so many unknown variables exist.

The behaviourists penchant for order and regularity in their efforts to develop a technology of behaviour patterns is based on their assumption that nature and the universe operate in mechanistic terms and is therefore controllable. The critics point out the fallacy of this assumption, which is, by its very nature, uncertain.

The preceding discussions on different philosophical theories was attempted in an effort to relate the philosophical systems to educational practice in general, while at the same time trying to analyse Krishnamurti's educational ideas. It is futile to attempt to construct Krishnamurti's educational ideas and objectives without an intellectually guiding frame of reference. The effort is to see how Krishnamurti linked these philosophies together in some intelligible whole by abstracting important

elements and binding these together conceptually into a theory in its own right.

Krishnamurti's educational ideas seem to lack culture specific relatedness as was seen in most of the contemporary philosophies discussed earlier. There is neither the Indian cultural ethos nor western ideological moorings in his articulation.

53  
While Swami Vivekananda's contribution to educational theory is often 'seen' as an unique contribution with universal appeal, it is evident that his theory was rooted in Indian philosophical doctrine. His philosophy was founded on Vedantic tradition which comprises the highest spiritual and ethical values of mankind and the teachings of the Upanishads acclaimed by him to have the strength and dimension to provide solutions to existing social problems. Man, for Vivekananda, is more than pure mind. He is the very incarnation of God. Vivekananda believed that Karma Yoga as a system of ethics and 'religion' is needed for the attainment of self control and self realization and he placed service to mankind as the highest goal of religion.

Vivekananda's educational philosophy based on the perfection and purity of mind. Accordingly knowledge is inherent in man and the whole movement in education should

aim at discovering this infinite knowledge. It can therefore be interpreted that the external world is the motivating factor leading to the study of one's own mind. He believed that education could be used as the instrument for the betterment of humanity by orienting the educational programmes for the development of mental ability and moral characters.

According to him "the ideal of all education, all training, should be this man-making. But instead of that, we are always trying to polish up the outside ... The end and aim of all education is to make the man grow. The man who influences ... is a dynamo of power, and when that man is ready, he can do anything and everything he likes, that personality put upon anything will make it work".<sup>54</sup>

Vivekananda drew a clear line against the practice of education being a mere form of accumulation of information. The basis of all systems, social or political rests upon the goodness of man and he was convinced that education must play an important role in helping the pupil identify with the rest of humanity with a feeling of compassion. He realised that through education man's multifaceted personality could be realised if the process of education focussed on character building and physical development; self reliance and self sufficiency; service to humanity,

brotherhood and spirituality of man. Hence it is clearly seen that his basic objectives of education were a strong reinterpretation of Vedic philosophy so as to revive the lost tradition.

Rabindranath Tagore interpreted education as the highest purpose of man and emphasized the all-round development of the child through the activities of mind and body. He believed that education relates with all aspects of our life, be it social, intellectual, spiritual or economic and the main objective of education is the freedom of the mind. Tagore believed that the schools should be ashrams, in the midst of the peace of nature, where life is not merely meditative but fully awake in its activities, and where they are 'bidden to realize man's world as God's Kingdom' and 'where the teacher and the student sit at the same table to partake of life'. His concept of relating nature to the human spirit was apparent in the natural atmosphere of piety which was created in his ashram. He upheld the supremacy of the simple and the natural. The significance of the school atmosphere for the development of sensitiveness of the 'soul' is what, in the final analysis, allows freedom from ignorance and apathy.

Krishnamurti's emphasis on an ideal natural setting for his schools as experiments of learning are similar to Tagore's

concept of the ashram. Influence of Rousseau is obvious as he too believed that the true flowering of the mind of the child can only take place in the midst of peaceful and natural surroundings. The point to be made here is not that one philosopher draws out from another in the methodology of his educational practice but that when the objective is toward the total good of man the logistics of getting to the ultimate goal overlap in this upward movement of finally reaching the goals.

Gandhi too like Swami Vivekanand and Tagore believed that education was the 'drawing out of the best - body, mind and spirit' through the harmonious development of the child. Gandhi made 'craft' a nucleus of the whole instruction since he believed that it is through practical work that one attains intellectual development and from there on pursue towards the attainment of the realised self.

Many educationists could have been justifiably discussed with Tagore, Vivekananda and Gandhi since India had many outstanding philosophers at the time who had an impact on contemporary educational development in the country. The striking resemblance about these philosophies is their non-conformist bias either to traditional Indian ethos or western ideological moorings, and the response to new ideas and break-throughs especially in the field of psychology

which had certain important inputs in contemporary developments in education. It may be remembered that, Gestalt theory was put-forth around 1925; the theory of Behaviourism was the work of J.B. Watson (1878-1958) and Ivan Pavlov (1848-1936) and Psychoanalysis was the work of Freud (1858-1939).

Any educational setting must be understood in relation to the social, political and cultural context. The demand for modernization of techniques due to large scale industrialization with its far reaching social and moral implications and associated dangers is what made Tagore, Vivekananda, Gandhi and other thinkers at that time conscious of the dangers associated with these developments. The reason for this reaction was found mainly in the Indian tradition which values the simple pattern of life and maintains that the demand and supply of needs, other than basic needs is not what ultimately leads to satisfaction and enduring happiness. Thus it shifts the focus from values to material gains, and, from the inner to the outer. Happiness is then determined not from what man makes of his life but what he is able to acquire by way of material possessions. Although Gandhi and others realised that poverty is a great evil and that it demoralizes man, they placed an emphasis on ideas other than industrialization and accumulation of material goods. The

impact of the West on Indian life and culture came at a crucial point of time when the tempo in the West had been greatly accelerated by science and technology. As a pioneer of new experiments in social life and educational theories, it brought with it the wider usage of English language, generated ideas of freedom, democracy and social traditions. Most important it established new educational systems. It is unfair to totally underrate the value of Western contribution to Indian culture, as it offset a creative trend to reassess the traditional patterns of life; to awaken a new interest in the development of Indian languages; to reinterpret ancient and classical scriptures. This was the culmination of a new and invigorating nationalism from which emerged the educational ideas of Swami Vivekananda, Tagore, Gandhi and other eminent educationists. Gandhi was a striking combination of a revolutionary, a traditionalist and a pragmatic educationist. He too like Vivekananda and Tagore did not sever from the moorings of tradition and Vedantic values although he had a futuristic vision of India.

Krishnamurti devoted his life to the task of bringing about a psychological revolution, which as he calls it, is a total revolution, transforming human existence as a whole. At present our existence is self-centred, and our problems are created by us through self-centered action.

Krishnamurti speaks of action based on love and an intelligent understanding of life as a whole.

Liberal education is an education based fairly and squarely on the nature of knowledge itself. It is not a vocational, scientific or specialist education. The fully developed Greek notion of liberal education was rooted in a number of related philosophical doctrines: first about the significance of knowledge for the mind, and, secondly about the relationship between knowledge and reality. In the first category there was the doctrine that it is the peculiar and distinctive activity of the mind, because of its very nature, to pursue knowledge. The achievement of knowledge satisfies and fulfills the mind which thereby attains its own appropriate end. The pursuit of knowledge is thus the pursuit of the good of the mind, therefore an essential element in the good life.

The second group of doctrines asserted that the mind, in the right use of reason, comes to know the essential nature of things and can apprehend what is ultimately real and immutable. From these doctrines there emerged the idea of liberal education as a process concerned simply and directly with the pursuit of knowledge. Thus there is no thought of defining education in terms of knowledge and skills that may be useful or in terms of moral virtues and

qualities of mind that may be considered desirable.

In this concept education is based on what is true and it therefore has finality which no other form of education has. Secondly, liberal education has a value for the person as the fulfillment of the mind, a value which has nothing to do with vocational or utilitarian considerations. Thirdly, because of the significance of knowledge in the determination of the good life as a whole, liberal education is essential to man's understanding of how he ought to live, both individually and socially. Hence liberal education is freeing the mind to function according to its true nature, freeing reason from error and illusion, and, freeing man's conduct from wrong.

It was the demand for an education whose definition and justification are based on the nature and significance of knowledge itself and not on the predilection of pupils, the demands of society, or the whims of politicians that prompted the Greeks in ancient times for an education in the seven liberal arts'; and in more recent times called for an education that aimed at the cultivation and development of the mind in the full range of man's self understanding.

The significance of the concept originally came directly

from the status the basic doctrines give to knowledge, in a unified picture of the mind, and, its relation to reality.

Liberal education is therefore best understood in terms of the characteristics of mind to which it leads. By characteristics is meant the aims of education and the abilities sought, such as to think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments, to discriminate among values.

A liberal education is then, one that, determined in scope and content by knowledge itself, is thereby concerned with the development of mind. It is because it is based on these ultimate principles that characterize knowledge itself that a liberal education is in a very real sense the ultimate form of education. In spite of the absence of any metaphysical doctrine about reality, this idea of liberal education has a significance parallel to that of the original Greek concept. It is an education concerned directly with the development of the mind in rational knowledge, whatever form that freely takes.

What then one may ask is the import of this concept for the practical conduct of education? First and foremost the distinction between various forms of knowledge must be attempted and then, relate them in some way to the

organization of the curriculum. The various forms of knowledge can be seen in low level developments within the common area of our knowledge of the everyday world. From this there branch out the developed forms, which, taking certain elements in our common knowledge as a foundation, have grown in distinctive ways. In the developed forms of knowledge the following features are to be noted:

1) They each involve central concepts that are particular in character to the form: for example those of motion, displacement, oxygen and carbondioxide, characteristic of the sciences; integral, divisor, parallelogram, characteristic of mathematics.

2) In a given form of knowledge these and other concepts that denote certain aspects of experience form a network of possible relationships in which experience can be understood. The form has a distinctive logical structure i.e., the terms and statements of electricity can be related in strictly limited ways.

3) The form, by virtue of its particular terms and logic has expressions that in someway are testable against experience. This is the case in scientific knowledge, moral knowledge and art.

4) The forms have developed skills for exploring experience and testing their distinctive expressions. For example, the skills of science and those of different literary arts.

All knowledge involves the use of symbols, and the making of judgments can only be learnt in tradition. The art of scientific investigation, the appreciation of a poem are not just communicable by words and hence have to be learnt from a master. The forms of knowledge are referred to as disciplines. They are indeed disciplines that form the mind. The dividing lines that can be drawn between different disciplines (by means of the four suggested distinguishing marks) are not clear enough for demarcating the whole world of modern knowledge. Hence only broad divisions are apparent. The sciences depend on empirical and observational tests, mathematics depends on deductive demonstrations. But within these areas further distinctions are made by the grouping of knowledge around related concepts or particular skills or techniques. Science and arts can be thus divided within the larger units. Besides there is also knowledge that is characteristically rooted in more than one discipline and is simply held together by their subject matter, drawing on all forms of knowledge that can contribute to them. Geography as the study of man in relation to his

environment is an example of a theoretical study of this kind, and engineering a subject of a practical nature. Many of the disciplines borrow from each other.

Thus it can be concluded that liberal education is concerned with the comprehensive development of the mind in acquiring knowledge. Curricula cannot therefore be constructed in terms of information and isolated skills but as interrelated aspects of each of the several disciplines thereby covering (at least in some measure) the range of knowledge as a whole. Though its aim is comprehensive it is not after the acquisition of information.

Krishnamurti thought of education on these very lines and did not believe that cluttering the mind with information was the main objective of education. Krishnamurti asks a very pointed question in this direction: "Can the mind keep in touch with that which is the source of all happiness? Can this openness be sustained in spite of knowledge and techniques, in spite of education and the crowding in, of life?"<sup>55</sup> The openness that Krishnamurti talks of can be sustained, but only when the educator is educated to this reality, only when he who teaches is himself in touch with the source of creative happiness. It is this coming to look at things in a certain way that is being aimed at, in liberal education - not the ability to work out in detail

what can be discerned. The aim of the study of a discipline in liberal education is concerned with developing a person's ways of understanding experience and not mastering the detail of knowledge.

56

Psaul Hirst in his essay 'Liberal Education and the Nature of Knowledge' asserts that 'it is possible to construct programmes that are in the first place organized round certain fields of knowledge either theoretical or practical. A regional study that introduces historical, geographical, industrial and social considerations might for instance be one element in such a scheme. It is important to recognize that the fields are chosen because together they can be used to develop understanding of all the various forms of knowledge'.

All the fields of study demand the highest skill from the teacher. Krishnamurti in his experiments with schools repeatedly addressed the teachers and also the pupils in dialogues for a better understanding of the whole process of learning. Fundamental to his views is the understanding that there is no essential difference between the teacher and the taught, and they both function at the same level in the active process of learning.

Whatever the pattern of a liberal education in its later

stages, a broad basic education in the common area of everyday knowledge where the various disciplines can be seen in embryo and from which they grow into distinct units, is being presupposed at all stages. It is from here that the range of a child's experience grows into an understanding of the scientific, religious, moral and other aspects of life. Krishnamurti regards education as of prime significance in the communication of that which is central to the radical transformation of the human mind. This transformation can occur when the child while being trained in various skills and disciplines is also given the opportunity to be awake to the processes of his own mind (thinking, feeling). When the environment is conducive to the child he becomes observant, self critical and perceptive and moreover he is able to discover the areas where knowledge is necessary and where irrelevant (and even harmful!). This according to Krishnamurti is one of the fundamental tasks of education. A new dimension in education is realised when the mind can discern where knowledge is irrelevant and cumbersome (in Krishnamurti's expression crowding and cluttering the mind with information!). It is then that the potential of the human mind is activated.

It is in this context that the following chapter will highlight Krishnamurti's Philosophy from which his educational ideas were crystallized.

## NOTES

1. Plato (427-347 B.C) was a Greek philosopher who also opened up his own school, The Academy, where students and professors engaged in a dialectic approach to problems.
2. Plato, The Republic, Translated by B. Jowett, N.Y. Modern Library, 1941.  
This has been Plato's most thorough statement on education, and one of the greatest expressions of idealist philosophy.
3. Critical perspective: When we examine Plato's views regarding preparation in the dialectic, through a preparation involving a lengthy period of education, beginning in studies with mathematics\*, it is possible to understand, Plato's criticism of inexperienced people who used the dialectic.  
\*Mathematics demonstrated that eternal truths were possible: Concepts such as  $2 + 2 = 4$  is a universal truth with which all men can agree.
4. St. Paul, born Saul of Tarsus was one of the writers of the New Testament. Since Tarsus was a city influenced by Greek culture, the idealism in St. Paul's writing stems from the Jewish and Greek traditions.
5. Saint Augustine, According to Augustine, the individual thinker does not make the truth. He finds it. It is innate and the teacher can only help the student to see for himself what he already knew.
6. Berkeley, held the opinion that immaterial substance (ideas) had been profaned by science.
7. Kant, Education, Translated by Churton A., University of Michigan Press, 1960.  
This book introduces the Kantian influence into aspects of education from discipline to curriculum.
8. H. Ozmon, S. Craver, Philosophical foundation of Education, A. Bell & Howell, Ohio, 1981, p.12.

9. Immanuel Kant, Critique of Practical Reason. Translated by Lewis White Beck. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1956.
10. John Paul Strain, Idealism: A clarification of an educational Philosophy. Educational Theory 25, 1975, pp. 263-71.  
This article is a recent survey of the contributions of philosophical idealism to education in the 20th century. Although the author recognizes the declining popularity of the idealist approach to philosophy, he points out that many people still hold an idealist philosophy of education which is revealed in continuing practices and traditions in educational institutions.
11. J. Krishnamurti, Authentic notes of discussion and talks given at Ojai and Sarobia in 1940, Ommen 1940, p. 57.
12. Donald Butler, Four Philosophies, New York: Harper 1951.
13. Philosophies of Education. The Forty-first yearbook of the national Society for the Study of Education, Edited by Nelson B. Henry, Chicago. The National Society for the Study of Education, 1942. (U.S.I.S. Library).
14. J. Krishnamurti, Authentic reports of 10 talks given at Ojai in 1944, Madras 1946, p.27.
15. J. Krishnamurti, On Education, KFI, 1974, p. 177.
16. J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on Living, II, KFI, 1991, pp. 102-103.
17. Aristotle, Politics, New York : Modern Library, 1943 (U.S.I.S. Library).
18. Henri Bergson, Creative Evolution, Translated by Arthur Mitchell, N.Y. Modern Library 1944.
19. St. Thomas Aquinas, (1225-74) scholastic philosopher whose first service to philosophy was to make the works of Aristotle known and acceptable to the Christian West.
20. J. Locke, On Education, Edited by Peter Gay, New York, Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1964.

This work has some of Locke's best articulations on education. It deals with educational problems ranging from individual learning experiences to the importance of environment. It is an empirical approach to education and represents in some way early modern realism.

21. Bertrand Russell, Education and the Good Life, New York: Boni and Liverright, 1926.  
This book is a leading educational statement and is polemical in its stress for social reform. It displays Russells reformist tendencies.
- , On Education, Especially in early childhood, Unwin Paperbacks, London, 1985.  
Russell tried to put his educational ideas to work at the school he founded called 'Beacon Hill'.
22. J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on Living, II, KFI, 1991, p.26.
23. Charles Pierce, Philosophy and Human Nature, New York : New York University Press, 1971.
24. John Dewey, How We Think, Boston: D.C. Heath 1983.
25. John Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, N.Y. E.P. Dutton, 1961.
26. J.J. Rousseau, Emile, Translated by Alan Bloom, New York.
27. J. Krishnamurti, Talks and Dialogues, Saanen 1968, p. 87.
28. A.S. Neill, Summerhill, New York: Hart, 1960.
29. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI, 1992, pg. 20.
30. Ibid., p.99.
31. The Republic. Although attempts to change such a society failed, it was perhaps because Plato was simply ahead of his time.
32. St. Augustine, City of God, Image Books, New York 1958.
33. Karl Marx, Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Science. Translated and edited by Lloyd D. Easton and Kurt Guddat. Garden City, New York, Anchor Books Edition, 1967.

34. Aldous Huxley, Brave New World, New York : Bantam 1932.
35. George Orwell, '1984', New York, Harcourt Brace, 1949.
36. Bertrand Russell, Principles of Social Reconstruction, London,. Allen & Unwin, 1916.
37. B.F. Skinner, Walden Two, New York, Macmillan 1948. This book is a fictional account of a futuristic social experiment.
38. Theodore Brameld, Toward a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education. N.Y.: Dryden 1956.
39. Alvin Toffler, Future Shock, Bantam Books, New York, 1981.
40. S.A. Kierkegaard, Fear and Trembling and the Sickness unto Death, Translated by Walter Lawrie, Princeton, N. Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1954.
41. Martin Buber, I and Thou, Translated by R.G. Smith, New York, Charles Scribner's, 1958.
42. Jean Paul Satre, Existentialism and Human Emotions, Translated by Hazel Barnes, New York, Philosophical Library 1947.  
This is an exceptional introduction to Sartre's ideas as well as to his style of philosophy.
43. J. Krishnamurti, On Education, KFI, 1974, p. 171.
44. Ibid., p. 53.
45. Ibid., p. 19.
46. Ibid., p. 20.
47. B. Mohan, Conceptualization of Existential Intervention Psychol: Q.J. Human Behaviour, 1979, pp. 39-45.
48. J. Krishnamurti, Early Writings, I, p. 159.
49. J.B. Watson, Behaviourism, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

50. B.F. Skinner, Beyond Freedom and Dignity, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.  
This book gives a descriptive account of his views.
51. J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on Living, p.100
52. Ibid., pp. 100-101.
53. The complete works of Swami Vivekananda, Mayavati Memorial Edition, Advaita Ashram, Calcutta, 1992, Vols. 1-8.
54. ----, Vol II, p. 15.
55. J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on Living, II, pp.2-3.
56. P. Hirst, Knowledge and the Curriculum, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.  
  
----, Liberal education and the nature of knowledge  
- an abridged essay.

## CHAPTER III

### RE-READING KRISHNAMURTI AS A PHILOSOPHER OF EDUCATION

Until recently philosophy of education received sporadic attention in the educational perspective merely as principles of education. The educational works of thinkers who varied greatly in philosophical quality and spread across the spectrum from Plato to Dewey offered generalized discussion of curricular aims, methodology and organization giving rise to a more disciplined and analytical approach rooted in general philosophy. As a new-emerging discipline, philosophy of education draws from four main branches of philosophy: Questions raised in ethics concerning value and which relate to the aims and justification of overall conceptions of education and to the more specific area of moral education; Social philosophy which contributes to principles of organization within the institution raising issues connected with freedom and authority, rights, equality and political accountability; Epistemology for questions of curriculum construction, whether certain areas of knowledge are fundamental and ideological; and philosophy of mind the relevance of which contributes to a better understanding of

learning and teaching, emotions and behavior, always keeping in mind, the learner at the centre of the educational process.

Philosophy of education is so wide in scope that no branch of philosophy can be excluded as being without some contribution to make or some relevant commentary to offer. Almost echoing Dewey,<sup>1</sup> it might be affirmed that philosophy of education is simply general philosophy.

Throughout his life Krishnamurti heralded the liberating experience of meeting reality afresh, with total freedom from fixed attitudes.

His modus operandi is direct, leading the individual to discover and examine the obstacles in the way of such experience and thereby remove it by the very awareness of their causes and effects. His mode of exposition is out of the ordinary in that he does not argue and assert but he enquires and discusses; he does not invent and propound theories but discovers; he does not reason but takes the individual on an adventure of enquiry the outcome of which is not known even to himself. To Krishnamurti, reality has to be discovered afresh with every experience, which means it cannot be framed into a doctrine or a philosophy in the accepted sense of the word. Krishnamurti begins from a

particular psychological problem and with clarity exposes the hidden workings of the mind to reach at a point at the end of which is not a conclusion but an experience. The constant renewal of enquiry is very characteristic of Krishnamurti. Everytime he makes a new departure and with reckless abandon discards all antecedents to enquire anew. The permanent aspect of his way of teaching is only the permanence of renewal - he helps man in removing the obstacles to the discovery of himself.

The main aspect of Krishnamurti's method of discourse is his "seemingly" contradictory exhortation. Krishnamurti's critiques have often used such exhortations to undermine the ultimate objective of his philosophy, namely "wholesome" life, devoid of fragmentation of consciousness.

One can employ Austin's analysis of performative utterances to understand some of the alleged contradictions or anomalous exhortations. Austin while recognizing many (infinite) uses of language concentrated on "utterance that looks like statement and grammatically would be classed as a statement, which is not non-sensical and yet is not true or false".<sup>2</sup>

By these statements of utterances, a person is not saying something by doing something. Although these utterances

are not in themselves statements of facts and consequently neither true or false, they very often 'imply' that certain things are true but not false. Austin found the distinction between performatives and constatives unsatisfactory and alternatively proposed three kinds of speech acts: locutionary act which designates its proportional content (more or less definite sense and references); illocutionary act which the speaker performs such as promising, avowing, or commanding (act performed in performing the locutionary act); and perlocutionary which is the effect the speaker produces on the hearer (which is the act one may succeed in performing by means of illocutionary act).<sup>3</sup>

In performing the locutionary act of saying that a door is open, I may be performing an illusionary act of stating, hinting or exclaiming; and by performing the perlocutionary act, of getting you to shut it. In the same way, by performing the locutionary act of saying 'down with the monarchy' one may succeed in the perlocutionary act of bringing about a revolution, whereas in performing the locutionary act I would be inciting a revolution. Krishnamurti in his talks lays bare the illusion of opposites and the opposites which are mutually exclusive on one level, become identical on a higher level. He says, for instance: "Violence as a means to peace is only the

4

perpetuation of violence".

Again for instance, 'those who struggle against possessiveness and cultivate the virtue of non-possessiveness, make of it a new acquisition and are caught in the net of illusion'.

Hence although the method of enquiry developed by Krishnamurti is also in the lines of psychology of introspection it is more on the lines of the phenomenological approach beginning from an inspection of one's own conscious, and particularly intellectual processes. All assumptions about the external causes and consequences of these internal processes have to be excluded. To simply state, Krishnamurti's attitude is one of understanding the ordinary in an extraordinary way!

To understand the educational ideas of Krishnamurti, it is inevitable that one must acquaint not only with all the antecedents of the ideas that formed his schools but it is equally significant to understand his philosophical ideas. The impact of his ideas have to be considered in totality and a rigid categorization of his ideas as philosophical and educational detracts the focus from the totality of his teachings. He speaks from the depths of a rare inner intuition and with tremendous intensity of purpose rejects

culture and reason in favour of nature and intuition. In the most general terms he likens inspiration to 'intuition', the highest point of intelligence acting spontaneously. His teachings afford an insight <sup>into</sup> on the state of Being in which action is total and complete, immediate and spontaneous and based not on idea but on the intuitive perception on the oneness of all life.

Krishnamurti's paradoxical expressions are formed naturally and spontaneously from a scale of values which are directly opposite to the ones commonly accepted. His exceptionally intuitive approach to teaching is not through a process of discursive reasoning but proceeds from a central standard of Truth. According to Krishnamurti 'Truth is a pathless land' and it is not determined by an external goal, an objective but is the realization of pure Being which is unconditioned. For, he believes that Truth is not a matter of belief which is a product of culture and tradition but has to be discovered through self knowledge without the interference of thought and through the direct experience of reality. Reality is the unknown, the immeasurable and belief reduces it to the known. The idea is the known, the symbol of the known. Ideas are the symbols of name and form that recall experience. The word, the symbol, the idea itself is not the thing it signifies. It is significant here to realise our true relationship to ideas. Therefore

identification with the idea, with the symbol, with the word, actually conditions and divides the mind. Beliefs, as Krishnamurti sees it, is a form of identification with idea and there is no reality in belief but only the craving for continuity: "Continuity is the self maintaining process of consciousness, from which arise individuality, through ignorance, which is the outcome of want ...".<sup>5</sup> So although the 'I' can continue, for continuity is its very essence, it cannot grow into immortality which is timeless. That is how, belief as identification with idea, is used by the mind to continue in time. Ideas are the symbols of the known and hence are useful tools of the mind in the field of the known and to step out of this field the mind must cease to be.

Whatever the external circumstances, the individual lives in an oscillating state of the mind without a perfect balance between pleasure and fear. His approach therefore is a synthesis of understanding and action, a harmony of mind and body and a perfect balance of thought and emotion.

Krishnamurti's apparently radical assertions are in fact supported not only by recent findings in psychology and quantum physics but 'resemble' more closely such esoteric eastern disciplines as Yoga Vedanta and Zen. In Zen, the aim is self integration which leaves no room for self-

oscillating between 'to be' or 'not to be'. The Koan which is a logically insoluble riddle employed in the strategy to lead to enlightenment, is deciphered only when rational thinking is suspended and intuition takes over. Krishnamurti does not equate intelligence with intuition. He says, "you cannot divide intuition from intelligence in the higher sense .... Intuition is the apotheosis, the accumulation of intelligence.<sup>6</sup> Thus the outcome of experience or the residue of experience is intelligence. Krishnamurti envisages humanity as a single unit and is convinced that a psychological revolution can bring about a transformation within oneself only when the process of one's thinking is understood. One has therefore to be aware of one's self, one's conditioning and the identifications that create the 'self image'. It is only then that one can be liberated from the limitations imposed on intelligence. Thus man must free himself from the authority of the self centeredness. This transformation of the individual focuses on the extradition of the self centeredness liberating him from the 'I' consciousness.

'Psychological division' for Krishnamurti means the fragmentation of consciousness i.e. a division within the psyche. Accordingly it is only a radical transformation of the psyche that will finally bring about social change and not as the behaviourists argue that it is through the pre-

arrangement of the environment that such a change can occur. Accordingly behaviour and attitudes are affected by psychological processes. When Krishnamurti talks of freedom he means being free of fear and other psychological restraints. For Krishnamurti, freedom is not the opposite of bondage, i.e. not a means to an end. This argument has a semblance of likeness to the ideas of some behaviourists who describe the process of integration through the self-actualization process implying free acceptance and the power of choice. Hence although for Krishnamurti choice does not directly imply freedom, the process of opening the dark field of the psyche has a direct bearing on accepting 'what is' without the interference of thought.

It is important to understand in this context that in the process of thinking which is self knowledge there is only one unitary process and the thinker and the thought are not two and consequently there is no duality and hence there is no choice and no conflict. But according to Krishnamurti, when the mind adheres to beliefs which is identification with idea it will always be divided in the 'what is' and 'what is not'. Hence while for the behaviourists view choice is essential, Krishnamurti departs from this line of thinking and accepts freedom as "choiceless awareness" and "actualizing" is thus the denial and dissolution of self. Therefore, while the behaviourists view is one of

reinforcing the formation of the self concept, Krishnamurti shifts the focus to the state of non-self.

Behaviourism was primarily the work of J.B. Watson<sup>7</sup>, who argues that responses or behaviours are affected by specifiable stimuli in the environment. Therefore the major goal is to identify those stimulus - response relationships. Both Watson and Skinner<sup>8</sup> saw the conditioning phenomenon as evidence of the importance of learning and of stimulus-response connections in behaviour. Accordingly all behaviour was learned. Whereas the focal<sup>9</sup> problem of behaviourism was learning, Gestalt<sup>9</sup> which means 'form' or 'organized whole' emphasized on the process in behaviour choosing primarily the theory of perception. Accordingly, the consistent theme within Gestalt explanations of behaviour is related to perception and 'learning' as an insightful process. Thus Gestalt is concerned with the completeness, the continuity and meaningfulness of behaviour as a whole arguing against the describing integrated human action by a mere analysis of component parts. Krishnamurti is primarily concerned with the psychological sense of the 'self' i.e. the sense of 'I-ness' which is the result of identification with a set of conditions which in turn condition intelligence and blocks it off from the 'wholeness of life'. A deep sense of insecurity underlies the sense of self which, compounded by

psychological pain accumulated over its lifetime seeks security and creates the psychological illusion of 'self' which seeks fulfillment through identification with experiences or even at the level of ideology.

Krishnamurti asserts that the self is the product of evolution, as there is in each one of you that element which is the result of the accumulation of experience. The psychological experience that Krishnamurti focuses on is relevant to the primal pain due to accumulation of feelings experienced in the past which continues to manifest itself in everyday life through neurotic symptoms. At this point Krishnamurti converges in agreement with the Gestalt which has a holistic approach to understanding of behaviour. Gestalt theory<sup>10</sup> is the first of the field theories presented by W. Kohler in 1925 and is identified as a theory of perception. It views the Gestalt field as a non static dynamic process in which the activity of the individual is homeostatically acted out through a behaviour pattern which satisfies a particular need. Hence, the psychological and behavioural processes are considered in totality, as an integrated function.

Perception is the process by which the brain constructs an internal representation of the outside experiences, which Krishnamurti defines as 'reality'. We are prevented from

directly experiencing the outside world since we experience only what the perceptual processes create for us, and, since the processes work so well we are unaware that what we are experiencing is an internal construction and not the world itself. This construction of the internal representation is a dynamic process. It is continuously on-going in time and is continually changing. Sensory information, memory, beliefs and expectations all contribute to the exact nature of this internal representation that is constructed at each moment in time.

According to Krishnamurti, "awareness is the understanding of the whole process of conscious and unconscious desire. In the very beginning of awareness there is the perception of what is true"<sup>11</sup> and the Gestalten approach also is concerned with promoting the individual's awareness of his own perception and the resultant related behaviour. Hence from the above it is conclusive that both move in the direction of a process of perception. In the Gestaltian process the integration of the individual's perception and action through awareness i.e. the integration of the psychological and behavioural processes as a unitary function influencing the field of emotive and physical behaviour is akin to Krishnamurti's meaning of 'self knowledge'. According to him self-knowledge comes through the choiceless awareness of 'what is' without the

understanding of the past. And while traditional psycho therapeutic processes are concerned with the antecedents of neurotic behaviour, Gestalt therapy is also concerned with what is happening to the individual in the present. Gestalt theory can be applied to nearly all forms of behaviour. Kohler,<sup>12</sup> argued that learning and problem solving like perception, are largely a function of organizational processes, 'How' and not 'Why' to behave in a particular situation may elude subjects until they see the various components of the task in their appropriate relationship. The situation becomes a problem primarily when the correct or necessary relationship among the elements is not visualized. This can result in the individual's (subject) behaviour taking the form of overt trial and error, or, covert 'thought'. The subject must then consider different perspectives on the situation until the right one emerges. At this point of emergence, the subject experiences a 'flash of insight' and the problem is finally solved in a 'flash' and the subject knows what to do. In the above description terms such as 'seeing', 'subjective', 'experience' all relate to the function of perception. This is the consistent theme within Gestalt explanations of behaviour. It is implied here that 'learning' and 'problem solving' are insightful processes. To Krishnamurti also 'choiceless awareness' is the intuitive response of discernment and if there is choice

there is no discernment. Gestalt psychology differs from other theoretical attempts to deal with learning on the basis of this major principle of 'insightful processes'.

On another plane, Gestalt theory argues against describing integrated human action by a mere analysis of component parts as what is imperative is with the completeness, the continuity, and the meaningfulness of behaviour as a whole. Krishnamurti adopts this approach when he discusses man in totality and not fragmented in consciousness, capable of a 'wholesome life'.

Gr  
The emphasis on the present, the 'now', is fundamental to Gestalt theory and is a dynamic state of constant flux. In comparison with the Zen view it is also equated with nothingness. While Einstein realised that time and space are products of our five senses, we therefore experience events as taking place in a sequential order. What Einstein and other pioneer physicists did was that they reassembled time and space into a new geometry that had no beginning or end, no edges no solidity. Every particle in the Universe turned out to be a bundle of energy vibrating in an immense void and Time and Space <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ replaced by a timeless flowing field of constant transformation. This quantum field is not separate from us - it is us. Krishnamurti in his effort to end the tyranny of thought

breaks into this new frontier of quantum physics when he speaks of a "flow of intelligence". (In Classical Indian Philosophy this flow of intelligence is called 'Prana' i.e. life force. A Yogi moves "prana" using nothing more than attention, for at a deepest level, attention and Prana are the same - life is awareness, awareness is life.)

In Gestalt theory if the subject clings to the past (i.e. memories and beliefs) then obstacles are created in the path of fluid Gestalten. Krishnamurti also holds the view that the past actually conditions the present and future, and, this interferes with our focus on the now since we drag the past experience into the present and future.

According to Perls, Gestalt therapy tries to place the "phenomenological approach ... and the behavioural approach with its emphasis on behaviour in the now"<sup>13</sup>.

Therefore the optimum result is when no time interval is created, in the sense, no psychological interval is created between action and perception: between the emergence of a thought and its consequent gratification. In Gestalt terms this relates to the loss of 'Gestalt fluidity', which means loss of the sense of 'nowness'. Krishnamurti also sees the futility of placing an ideal situation before one's perspective as it brings psychological illusion and the

futile search for an unrealisable goal; and the distancing from the actuality of 'what is' creates, what he terms as, <sup>psychological</sup> ~~psycghological~~ time. And this ultimately results in conflict and loss of creative energy. Krishnamurti <sup>out</sup> points that spontaneity and raw instinctive immediacy links perception, particularly the neurological aspect of it, and action without loss of psychological time.

Krishnamurti rejects the idea of psychological growth, that is, change over a period of time, because such change is not total and is only a modification. This creates division within the psyche reinforcing the 'self' by supplying it with a craving 'to become'. So long as this divisiveness exists based on the I - Center, the actual facts cannot be faced. This requires the total absence of the self.

Although Krishnamurti believes that the correct understanding of the working of the mind is important he does not separate the mind from the body and considers both together as a psycho-somatic unit. Krishnamurti urges one to live with the whole mind and not just at the conscious level, which is already impressed with memories and valuations. Both the subconscious and the unconscious are made up of memories which Krishnamurti classifies into factual and psychological. The factual are helpful to the

conscious mind in that it learns by experience, whereas psychological memories are of past valuations or judgement values, which are biased by strong emotional feeling and these surface to the conscious mind as a colouring, or a conditioning of the conscious content. This colouring has no fixed pattern and a suppressed fear, for instance, related to some pain can colour the situation beyond recognition which only remotely resembles the original experience. Therefore according to Krishnamurti a percept in the conscious mind is changed or conditioned by the 'colouring' of psychological memories only remotely related to the percept, just as the natural saliva - reflex of Pavlov's <sup>14</sup> dogs aroused by the natural stimulus of food is changed into a 'conditioned' saliva - reflex aroused by an unnatural stimulus of the green light.

It is important to note here that Krishnamurti does not <sup>15</sup> deny memory as such whether factual and psychological.

He concedes that without memory orderly living would not be realised and he does not object to remembering past feeling in so long as it is part of a past event. But what poses the real danger is its tendency to warp judgment and create conditioned emotional reflexes. Hence so long as memories of pleasure or pain remained factual, resulting in, for instance, eating with pleasure when hungry, the real problem was when the memory of pleasure creates desire

which is then projected to the present without sense or without proportion and the pursuit of pleasure becomes a fixed pattern of behaviour i.e. a system of habits centered round the I - complex. Krishnamurti points out that all the problems of one's existence are rooted in the addiction to the memories of past pains and pleasure. His method of solving this problem is extremely original in that he directs the individual to determine that the solution lies in the problem itself and it is not to be found outside the problem, and the right course that one must follow is therefore to understand the problem since the problem is the result of its cause. Learning to listen to what the problem reveals is to help the problem unfold and in this very act to let it dissolve itself. Krishnamurti terms this as being choicelessly aware of the problem without judgement or identification whereby the problem will reveal itself and in that unfolding it will resolve itself. Krishnamurti stresses on the need to clear the mind of problems for it is only when the mind is free from conditioning that it is able to discover truth.

Krishnamurti looks at another range of problems arising from the consideration given to time as past and future, to memories and expectations. He talks of living from moment to moment, that is, not in the past nor in the future but in the present. The time-sense is totally dependent on

memory. An organism without memory would get all the sense impressions one after another and unconnected. These impressions would seem to come to it from nowhere, from the unknown, and would vanish in a moment. Such an organism would be incapable of biological survival. Nature has therefore endowed living organisms with the ability to retain these sense experiences in memory. The result is that memories dominate the mind. This domination of memories i.e. of the past is necessary for biological survival. But this process has also resulted in accumulation of knowledge.

16

In the context of human relations<sup>16</sup>, the present has become conditioned and gripped by the past, and the future has ceased to be the unknown (as it was before the action of memory) and has become an expectation dependent of the past. Whereas this domination of memory has helped biological survival, in as far as human relations are concerned, an awareness of how all this happened is our first step to the restoration of the balance of human behaviour. The wiping out of memories is not what Krishnamurti suggests, as that would be as disastrous as it is impossible, but by realising that undue concern with the past is responsible for the undoing of our moment to moment awareness in the present.

In the field of long term memory, psychologists have been able to make a distinction between semantic memory and episodic memory. Semantic memory roughly corresponds to knowledge about the world and the meaning and grammar of our language for communication. Episodic memory roughly corresponds to personal memory of things actually experienced. Since different processes might be involved in storing and retrieving information between these two systems, this distinction, which until now is only a conceptual distinction, (since no clear-cut experiments have developed yet to demonstrate the different processes) is revelant in understanding why Krishnamurti demarcates the totality of consciousness as the whole field of thought: "Consciousness is ... the battleground of contradictory desires, the field of strife, struggle, pain, sorrow. It is also the revolt against this field, which is the search for peace, for goodness, for abiding affection. Self consciousness arises when there is awareness of conflict and sorrow, and the desire to be rid of them; also when there is awareness of joy, and the desire for more of it. All this is the totality of consciousness; it is a vast process of memory, or the past, using the present as a passage to the future. Consciousness is time, time as both the waking and the sleeping period, the day and the night".<sup>17</sup>

Hence what is most affected by the preoccupation with the past is the real future which from being the creative and evernew it has been reduced to the status of an anticipation of the known. Time is by its very nature a flow from future into the past, but Krishnamurti shows the error of reversing it from past into the future and this reversal of the time sense is what affects the present.

The understanding of what Krishnamurti means by 'creation of thought' has to be simultaneously understood with his interpretation of the role of knowledge and memory, particularly language in the conditioning and fragmentation of consciousness.

By "ending of thought" Krishnamurti does not imply that the individual ceases to 'know' but the function of knowledge shifts from that of merely conditioning the 'consciousness' to that of a more casual factor for helping consciousness. It is this subtle change from the function of conditioning to the function of assisting the consciousness which is what Krishnamurti calls the integrated intelligence, and it is only when the mind is empty, integrated or whole that there is a space, an intelligence which cannot be tainted by thought. It is in this condition of the mind that thought becomes the instrument of intelligence and not the reverse where intelligence becomes the instrument of

thought! This in essence is what Krishnamurti urges us to discover. Earlier in this Chapter a distinction was made between factual knowledge and psychological knowledge and when Krishnamurti refers to knowledge and the past, as conditioning our response to the present, he refers to psychological knowledge: "Memory is factual, as well as psychological. I am not talking of factual memory but of psychological memory".<sup>18</sup> But although the two types of knowledge are identical in all its aspects yet there is a difference in the determination of its quality for example when looking at a bird, the memory of a bird is the memory of a bird, but can one look at the bird without tainting it with previous memories of a bird? When this happens then it is not seen in its factness and the bird is seen in the psychological content.

<sup>19</sup>  
According to Piaget's description of the development of cognition, human intellect is constructed over time as the individual experiences progressively more complex interactions with the environment. Although he asserts that the initial source of development is biological, the pace of development is greatly influenced by the environment. In Piaget's system two processes actively operate during each of the four stages: Organization is the process by which different elements within a system maintain communication viz. organizing basic sensory

information (images, information) in order to form more complex ideas and thought. And Adaptation which consists of the complementary processes of assimilation and accommodation. These two processes are the basis for cognitive growth. While assimilation is the modification of external events to fit already existing schemata the complementary process of accommodation changes the internal structure to fit the demands of the environment.

The process is a dual one which balances between the demands of the external world and the structure of the mind.

Hence the self in its compulsive search for security and for the familiar, identifies with previous memories at both levels, the cognitive as well as the affective.

In psycho-analysis only the traumatic memories which inhibit behaviour are erased and Krishnamurti moves away from this method with his insistence on the total dissolution of psychological memory. For Krishnamurti to perceive the fact of 'something' there must be freedom from any psychological residue. Krishnamurti describes the residue as the accumulation of unfinished experiences, an experience which has not been fully understood: "There is freedom from accumulating memory, only when every thought,

every feeling is completed, thought out to the end".

This process of awareness, or the total movement of thought and feeling is what Krishnamurti refers to as self knowledge. Hence what is implied is that the self, the I-complex is the psychological residue to unfinished experiences and the inertia of this residue resists change. The 'self' then has to rely on 'self knowledge' to combat and free the mind of psychological memories. According to Krishnamurti, every thought is completely thought out and this happens only with awareness of the total process of perception. In the light of awareness, factual memory creates no image and hence there is no conflict. Hence there is no division in the psyche, no thinker as separate from thought. The mind is freed from itself as the thinker, the I-centre. The ending of thought creates a space between one thought and the next and it is at this point that creativeness is possible, and real learning and intelligence emerge. Here the self is totally absent and the movement in learning is spontaneous, responding to a wholistic energy transforming its direction from a mechanical response to a creative activity.

In primal therapy, primal memories prevent the cognitive integration with the affective state and this results in the loss of the present. Krishnamurti implies the loss of

?

'awareness' exactly on these lines, and agrees that only when the memory is purely factual and free from psychological residue affecting any future response can one be totally aware of the movement of thought and feeling.

The implication in the educative process is in the use of rewards and punishment to motivate learning. Through measurements and grading it is possible to determine how an educational task has to be attempted and there is the factual memory of knowing how to complete the task coupled with psychological memory of either praise or failure depending on which, the future responses will result. The factual memory of the performance is by itself not indicative of the degree of success but it is the psychological memory whether good or bad which forms the individual complex, conditioning from this point onwards the responses to other life situations.

Krishnamurti does not define intelligence in an explicit form but moves in the direction of defining it in terms of an integrated awareness. He says: "Integration is a state of complete attention. There cannot be complete attention if there is effort, conflict, resistance, concentration".<sup>21</sup> Integrated awareness is a state beyond thought and therefore unconditioned. It is a state of timeless energy.

D. Chopra in his book 'Unconditional Life' offers a similar observation: "Awareness has many levels, and it must be allowed to flow from one to the other for flow is its natural state". The effect here is holistic. The mind-body system reacts to every single stimulus and to stimulate one cell is to stimulate all. There is a parallel in quantum terms, since a reaction anywhere in space-time, including past, present and future, causes a shift in the entire quantum field. The fact that awareness behaves like a field is crucial to understanding intelligence. Getting in touch with one's inner intelligence is getting in touch with the creative core of life. In the new paradigm, control of life belongs to awareness, and the most basic processes of mind and body respond to the state of mind. Behind the billions of chemical changes occurring in the cells is the flow of awareness. Every thought or emotion is a fragment of awareness. What Krishnamurti termed the 'self' can be defined in modern psychological terms as a continuum of awareness, and the state known as unity consciousness is the state where awareness is complete, where awareness is the whole continuum. When awareness has become fragmented, when there is no continuum then the source, the course and the goal of all this flowing intelligence gets interrupted.

The new paradigm teaches us that emotions are not incidental happenings isolated in mental space; these are expressions of awareness, the fundamental 'stuff' of life. In this context 'thought' is redefined as an impulse of energy and information. Being aware, means participation in every reaction. The problem arises when we are not fully aware and it is this state, the state of not being fully aware, the state of total inattention, that turns the quantum field into ordinary material reality, due to which we cannot know the true texture of the quantum reality itself, either through the five senses or by thinking about it, for a thought also colours and transforms the field - it takes the infinite possibilities of the void and shapes a specified time-space event. According to Krishnamurti, where there is total awareness one never loses sight of the experience in the midst of experience and ones inner truth affirms carrying the consciousness of immortality in the midst of mortality. Matter and energy are held together by the deep intelligence that runs through all things and man although confined to time and space, is one aspect of that intelligence, experiencing the material world through the lens of perception.

In the educational perspective, Krishnamurti states that although intelligence can utilise knowledge, the reverse does not happen. Hence in the school curriculum, the

activities related to cultivation of memory and cognitive functions which are directly concerned with technical affinity cannot result in the "awakening of intelligence". Krishnamurti asserts that intelligence is not a 'measure' of cognitive ability - and the student who attains a high IQ score may inwardly be an insensitive and callous individual. Therefore to Krishnamurti, intelligence is the way the intellect is applied and the manner in which it integrates with action and feeling in any learning situation.

Intelligence according to Krishnamurti is wholistic, the integrated movement of thought and feeling. He states: "the intellect is satisfied with theories and explanations, but intelligence is not; and for an understanding of the total process of existence there must be an integration of the mind and heart in action. Intelligence is not separate from love".<sup>23</sup> Hence the intelligent scientist will use his scientific research for the enhancement of life and not the destruction of it. In Gestalt theory learning is determined by the whole pattern; it is a process of discovering and understanding relationships in one's environment. The responses thereby depend on the way one perceives the immediate i.e. the environment. In Kohler's<sup>24</sup> experiment of the chimpanzee, there is much trial and error before the right solution appears with

suddenness. The chimpanzee's behaviour was explained not in terms of trial and error but in terms of the animal's insight. The chimpanzee did not acquire right responses gradually and eliminate wrong ones gradually. An insight is therefore to be defined as the sudden awareness or perception of the relationship, in a situation. It does not happen immediately after a problem is presented. There is first trial and error, but instead of making the actual moves, the possible moves are thought out i.e. there is implicit trial and error. In solving the problem in a learning situation, the student is required to see the relationships between the various elements through implicit trial and error. Insight is influenced by past experience and depends upon the capacity of the learner. In Gestalt terms learning has therefore to be understood in more comprehensive terms.

In the educational dimensions, it implies that a learning situation should be so organized that significant relationships emerge. According to Krishnamurti our responses are conditioned by the past, making them predominantly cerebral and lacking in intelligence. Krishnamurti is suggesting a wholistic response to life which is not of the past but one which emerges from a significant awareness of the self and which is not paralysed by the interference of memory.

Contemporary movements in psychology have led to the indication that a somewhat more humanistic view of the person may be in order. Carl Rogers, <sup>25</sup> Fritz Perls and others held the view that each individual is unique and can determine his own fate by conscious exertion of the free will. They also stated that the exercise of reason and intuition was more important than environment and biology in determining the course of our development. While, the humanistic view emphasizes the 'self' as the integrating factor of thought and feeling, Krishnamurti's emphasis is on the primary role of the integrative intelligence and he considers the 'self' as the main disintegrating reactor. For Krishnamurti, the real task of education is not academic learning but the understanding of the self and how it inhibit-s the operation of intelligence.

While accepting that factual knowledge is important for an orderly existence, Krishnamurti places thought and knowledge in the right perspective so that the consciousness is not dominated. This is the basis of the radically different concept of learning which identifies it with the operation of the awakened intelligence. The general understanding of the term 'learning' implies the accumulation of knowledge, information and skills and in the process of acquiring 'thought' conditions the reaction of the brain.

The result here is that the responses become mechanical and there is no creativity. Thus the mind does not step beyond the field of the known, and the wholeness of life cannot be experienced. Thus according to Krishnamurti: "knowledge predominates, which is one of our greatest conditionings, and so the brain is never free from the known. It is always adding to what is already known, and so the brain is put into a straight-jacket of the known and is never free to discover a way of life which may not be based on the known at all".<sup>26</sup>

Krishnamurti heralds a spontaneous movement of learning, free from past conditioning and the field of the known; and free from the dichotomy between the knower and the known. In this observation from moment to moment, where thought no longer interferes with the process of perception and where perception functions spontaneously, a new dimension of learning emerges!.

## NOTES

1. John Dewey, Experience and Education, New York: Macmillan, 1938.
2. J.L. Anstin, Philosophical Papers, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979, p.235.
3. K.T. Fann, (ed.), Symposium on J.L. Anstin, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
4. J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on Living, KFI, 1991, pp. 24-25.
5. J. Krishnamurti, Authentic Reports of 8 talks given at Ojai in 1936, Ommen, 1936.
6. J. Krishnamurti, Early Writings, II, p. 76.
7. J.B. Watson, Behaviourism, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
8. B.F. Skinner, Beyond Freedom and Dignity, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.
9. F.S. Perls, Gestalt Therapy, Verbatim, Lafayette, Calif.: Real People Press, 1969.
20. Gestalt Theory was put forth by W. Kohler in 1925, and is identified as a theory of perception. It was at this point of time that Krishnamurti was in the formative and productive process of forming his own philosophical ideas. Gestalt was the first field theory, and Behaviourism and other theories followed in quick step creating an innovative approach to the understanding of the mind.
11. J. Krishnamurti, Authentic notes of discussions and Talks given at Ojai and Sarobia in 1940, Ommen, 1940.
12. W. Kohler, The Mentality of Apes, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1925.
13. F.S. Perls, 1970, p. 14.
14. I.P. Pavlov, Conditioned Reflex, New York: Dover Press 1960.  
Pavlov's dog Ivan Pavlov provided an impressive

demonstration of the use of stimulus response analysis in the famous description of classical conditioning. He observed that his experimental subjects i.e. dogs, came to salivate at the sound of a neutral stimulus - say, a bell - if food and bell were repeatedly paired together.

15. J. Krishnamurti, Krishnamurti's Talks at London in 1953 (Verbatim Report), London 1953, p.10.
16. R.K. Shringy, Philosophy of J. Krishnamurti. A Systematic Study, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers (P) Ltd., New Delhi 1976, pp. 240-243.
17. J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on Living, III, KFI, 1992, p. 292.
18. J. Krishnamurti, The First and Last Freedom, 1954, p. 248.
19. Piaget divides development into four major periods: sensorimotor, pre operational, concrete operational, and formal operational.
20. J. Krishnamurti, 1954, p. 247.
21. J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on Living, II, p. 51.
22. D. Chopra, is the Director of the Institute for Mind/Body Medicine and Human Potential at Sharp Health Care in San Diego, U.S.A.  
His book 'Ageless Body, Timeless Mind' (The Quantum Alternative to Growing Old) Harmony Books/New York, 1993, ... is a breath taking vision of human potential.
23. J. Krishnamurti, Exploration into Insight, KFI, Madras, 1979.
24. In Kohler's experiment of the chimpanzee, the behaviour was explained not in terms of trial and error but in terms of the animal's insight (Bourne L., and Estrand B. Psychology Its Principles and Meanings, N.Y. 1976, p. 195).
25. C.R. Rogers, On Becoming a Person: A Therapist's View of Psychotherapy, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
26. J. Krishnamurti, Letter to the Schools, KFI, 1981, p. 21.

## CHAPTER IV

### The Innovative Movement in Education

To know anything in its completeness is to know its fundamental value.

Value consists in the perception of a thing as a whole. The whole is certainly not a sum of its parts. Hence an abstraction cannot contain the whole truth. Scientific analysis of the Universe is obviously based upon an abstraction and deals with the process, the behaviour of things involved in any one particular phenomenon without giving an explanation of the phenomenon itself. Since values arise from a perception of life as a whole, it is quite evident that science is only able to create abstractions from the objective reality and deal with these in accordance with the instruments that it possesses. However due to the limitations of its method science cannot give a complete picture of the objective reality. Hence it does not deal with the whole event but with an aspect of that event. For example, it may study man as a 'biological unit' or as a 'psychological entity'. Science can deal only

with those aspects of things which are measurable and can be subjected to analytical observations. But those aspects which are immeasurable is what finally will give an understanding of man as a whole. It is this 'something' in man which eludes scientific method and analysis and which according to Krishnamurti is the most important in so far as man is concerned. Essentially therefore, "To know a man is to know him as a personality or as an individuality. It is true that this individuality contains all the parts that science has investigated, but it is greater than all the parts put together. This individuality integrates all the parts and has a uniqueness of its own which defies all scientific analysis. Thus science may examine the parts of a thing in minutest detail but it has no instrument wherewith it can give us an understanding of the thing as a whole".<sup>1</sup>

Krishnamurti arrives at another approach to the understanding of man and his universe, and that is not by analytical observation but by knowing the external reality as a whole, in its completeness. It is true that science does synthesise, but its synthesis is only a bringing together of the different aspects of phenomenon. Its synthesis is not the perception of a thing as a whole, it is only the summation of its parts. The scientific method can arrive at the exact relationship of the different

aspects of a thing through mathematical calculations and quantitative measurements. It can indicate about the laws of their behaviour but it cannot determine the purpose, the value of that particular thing. By the application of its mathematical laws it can release atomic energy but it cannot determine for what purpose that energy should be used. This is the limitation of the scientific method. A philosophy is only a way of looking at a phenomenon, at arriving at a point from where the perception of life as a whole is possible. It is thus an integrating force whereby a fundamental unity can be arrived at. It is the framework into which all the experiences can be drawn into a unified whole. Its aim is to give a subjective background into which the various objective factors can be fitted. When there is a disharmony between the objective and the subjective conditions, resulting from a shift in the level of human consciousness, which creates changes in the objective conditions and necessitates fresh interpretation of experiences as well as a new subjective background, then, a new philosophical approach becomes imperative. And for the discovery of values, "a perception of life as a whole from one's own scale of observation is essential. This means that there must be an appropriate subjective factor capable of bringing life's experiences into unified onewhole".<sup>2</sup>

The mind seems to be an ineffective instrument in the rapidly changing conditions of life, so far as the understanding of reality is concerned. It is too slow to interpret life's experiences, whose impacts come upon human consciousness in quick succession. Having recognised the limitations of the mind and its processes, an intuitive approach<sup>3</sup> to the understanding of reality becomes imperative. In order to gain an understanding of the fundamental values, reality has to be perceived, and to perceive reality it has to be sifted from its appearance. Science which uses the mind as its instrument of cognition cannot give this understanding of the fundamental values of life because it does not perceive reality and only deals with appearance; its observational order is coloured by the conceptual order. It does not see an object, it only sees what the mind has made of that object. Thus in the scientific method are seen two barriers to the objective reality - the one created by the observational order and the other by the conceptual order. The limitation of the sense perception together with the interpreting medium of the mind prevents science from seeing the objective reality as it is. Hence there lies the possibility of looking at reality not through the interpreting medium of the mind, but by means of a faculty which transcends the limitations of the mental processes.

According to Krishnamurti "consciousness is the product of the mind and the mind is the result of conditioning, of craving; and so it is the seat of the self. Only when the activity of the self, of memory, ceases is there a wholly different consciousness, about which any speculation is a hindrance".<sup>4</sup>

At this point he determines consciousness at two levels viz. the consciousness of the conditioned mind and the consciousness that is free from craving which is not a product of the mind and cannot be defined. Craving on the other hand implies identification and self consciousness. Thus, at the conscious level or at the unconscious level, our consciousness is never free from self consciousness. For Krishnamurti, " 'I' refers to both the conscious mind functioning as well as the unconscious".<sup>5</sup>

The I-process therefore arises from consciousness which constitutes of influences such as racial inheritance, tradition, individual experiences, knowledge, will, desire, reason and motive. It is the totality of thought-feeling, the process of response to challenge, which is experience. The response to the challenge which is inevitably 'new', is always reflective of the background namely 'the old'. Consciousness constitutes of factual and psychological memory; and experience. Experience is the memory of

experiencing and the process of naming or terming strengthens and gives continuity to the experiencer, to the characteristic of particularizing memory. According to Krishnamurti, this naming process must cease, not only on the superficial levels of the mind, but throughout its entire structure. For him: "The purgation of the mind must take place not only on its upper levels, but also in its hidden depths; and this can happen only when the naming or terming process comes to an end"<sup>6</sup>. This is a difficult proposition for "our whole consciousness is a process of naming or terming experience, and then storing or recording it. It is this process that gives nourishment and strength to the illusory entity, the experiencer as distinct and separate from the experience"<sup>7</sup>.

Consciousness is a response to stimulus, which is experience, and experience is the result of experiencing. The result when, given a name, goes to constitute memory and this concluding process goes to constitute consciousness. Consciousness is fundamentally the same as thought. Thought is the response to memory and to be conscious is to be aware of something known, its name, form and use. So, "consciousness at various levels is the total process of perception - contact - sensation - identification and experience"<sup>8</sup>.

It therefore constitutes the sphere of the known, of experience and memory; and of sensation. But just as experience cannot be confused with experiencing, and the understanding of experiencing lies above the senses, so also consciousness cannot be confused with awareness which is the state of experiencing more than sense perception. Consciousness also involves intelligence, it is endowed with the power of discernment and it functions as the individual. According to Krishnamurti the individual is not apart from his consciousness.

9

Individuality depends on consciousness. The individual is to be conceived as energy which is singular and which in its self-active development becomes consciousness, the generation of the I-process. It is not that the word consciousness as commonly understood has no iota of the significance attached to it by Krishnamurti. He uses it in a deeper sense of its usual connotation, namely, "our consciousness is not only a superficial layer, but also the deep hidden activity of the mind which is called the unconscious, and the mind is this whole psychological field".<sup>10</sup>

The divisions in the consciousness in terms of the conscious and unconscious, the self and the nonself, you and me, individual and collective are arbitrary and

conventional divisions pertaining to thought and not to the fact of consciousness. Hence in the question of bringing about a fundamental change in the structure of consciousness one has, according to Krishnamurti, to begin with the individual, i.e., with oneself. And if one is at peace and is free from contradiction due to the neglect of the deep hidden activity of the mind which is the unconscious, then one can begin to manifest a different structure of consciousness that is free from fear, from duality and from identification with idea. As Krishnamurti observes, "our constant struggle is between what 'is' and what 'should' be, between thesis and antithesis; we have accepted this conflict as inevitable, and the inevitable<sup>11</sup> has become the norm, the true - though it may be false".

Krishnamurti apprehends the problem of existence as a psychological as well as social phenomenon and to be aware of the conflict is according to him, to be aware not only of the conflict of ideologies, or the struggle of the classes, or the exploitation of the poor by the rich or of the weak by the strong and so on and so forth; but also to be aware of the inherent contradiction in the individual human being, the greed, the craving, the ambition etc. that prevades the mind of the individual beyond redress. Krishnamurti views the problem in an integrated way seeing the social phenomenon as a projection of the psychological

structure of the individual and perceives the conflict as a total process of human consciousness. He clearly observes: "we try to understand it either on the objective or the subjective level; and the difficulty is that the problem is neither purely subjective nor purely objective, but is a combination of the two. It is both a social and a psychological process, and that is why no specialist, no economist, no psychologist, no follower of a system, whether of the right or of the left can ever solve this problem. The specialists and experts can attack the problem in their own particular fields, they never treat it as a total process; and to understand it, one must approach it in its totality".

12

Going beyond 'metaphysics', Krishnamurti sees the universe as a movement, a becoming. Physical matter is nothing but change, a continual movement of whirling electrons and while this is the nature of matter, it is more so in the case of the inner psychological being. The real objective universe can thus be known as a continual movement. The mind however does not perceive this reality as a whole and it breaks up movement into successive conditions of change. The instrument which enables us to cognize this reality is not the intellect but another faculty which we call intuition. For Krishnamurti "intuition perceives the thing as a whole and not in parts, as the mind does. We can

understand ourselves as participants in this universe of  
change only through intuition".<sup>13</sup> The scientific method of  
analysis and synthesis does not give a view of life as a  
whole and the search for fundamental values, and, the  
perception of reality, as a whole, can be attained only  
with an intuitive approach.

According to Krishnamurti, it is not altogether impossible  
for humanity to bring about a mutation of mind, to  
establish the eternal as the supreme value, "To search out  
the real which alone can bring peace and joy. In it alone  
is there enduring unity of man, in it alone can conflict  
and sorrow cease; in it alone is there creative being.  
Intuition therefore comes to man from the realms which are  
subjective. The subjective level of consciousness is that  
which has not yet been exteriorized and is therefore  
totally from within. Thus intuition is a relative term for  
'within' which can be interpreted only with reference to  
'without'. Thus the faculty of consciousness higher than  
the normal can be termed intuition, but then it is only a  
mental concept, for that which is beyond the mind cannot be  
expressed in terms of the mind. Krishnamurti points out  
the limitations of the mind and the influence of memory on  
our thoughts. According to him, knowledge by ideation is  
no knowledge at all for it is knowledge only of the  
concepts which we have created, and he shows the path of

knowledge by being where the knower and the known are the same. Such a knowledge comes only in a state of non-duality and it is only through intuition that man frees himself from the realm of mental images and enters the world of reality. Krishnamurti looks at life as a whole and not in compartments. He says, only as man knows himself can he be free from the limitations that are imposed upon him by himself. Hence man must start with self knowledge as the only state of being in which the individual and the society created by him, can look at and see 'what is', and can thereby transcend the level of consciousness that breeds contradictions and problems of existence. To Krishnamurti, self knowledge is not just an intellectual discipline but a way of life. There is no ending to self knowledge. Self knowledge can only be discovered from moment to moment. And therefore there is a creative happiness from moment to moment. Thus: "to understand life and the significance of existence is to understand oneself as related to and involved in others, which is society, which is the whole".<sup>14</sup> Self knowledge is therefore necessary to establish right relationship, to establish order in society and to have peace. "Self knowledge forms the basis of social order, of harmonious society".<sup>15</sup> The purpose of right relationship is self discovery for the self reveals itself in its responses to the challenges of life. Hence, "right relationship

proceeds from right action, and right action proceeds from  
right thinking which comes only with self knowledge".<sup>16</sup>  
Self knowledge therefore implies the action of relationship  
between two individuals as also the action of relationship  
in society thereby constituting the basis of true social  
order. "Self knowledge is important as the first step to  
the discovery of truth".<sup>17</sup> Krishnamurti considers self  
knowledge as the only state of being in which the  
| individual and the society created by him can transcend the  
level of consciousness that breeds problems and  
contradictions and can see 'what is'. Self knowledge leads  
us to Truth and creates the silence of mind which makes  
choiceless awareness possible. Choiceless awareness can  
transform the structure of human consciousness by putting  
an end to the perpetuation of duality. Awareness is  
awakened intelligence, intuitive, discernment and to be  
aware with one's entire being seems to be the central theme  
of Krishnamurti's purpose of education. Self knowledge  
demands intuitive discernment, sensitive receptivity,  
constant alertness, awareness, a continual and essential  
curiosity and above all freedom from fear, from the  
influence of memory on the thought-process, detachment from  
sensible values and an independent self enquiry. It  
therefore demands an austerity of purpose in action and in  
one's relationship. Krishnamurti is suggesting the action  
of intelligence, the operation of awareness as the only way

to break through the field of time. Awareness is the direct perception of 'what is' without the process of ideation and without the interference of thought. It is the unhindered movement of the mind that is not conditioned by identification with any idea and that is not tainted by the accumulation of memory. Hence awareness is not an intellectual process and it implies self knowledge in action. It is operative during the course of action and involves focusing of total and undivided, undistracted attention on 'what is', without concentrating on an object of choice. Awareness is therefore an effortless and spontaneous concentration of attention, and self-knowledge is possible only through choiceless awareness in action. Life is action, according to Krishnamurti, and relationship is the field of action which reflects the self. In the very beginning of awareness, there is the perception of what is true; truth is not a result or achievement, but it is to be understood. It is through self-knowledge that there is the realization that the self is part of consciousness. What Krishnamurti calls creative thinking is in actuality right thinking, which is the process of being aware without evaluation, or acceptance or condemnation, or justification, or judgment. It is constant awareness and rises spontaneously with self knowledge which is the perception of the ways of the self. While the intellect is the faculty of knowing, reasoning and ideation in the

absence of emotion. Krishnamurti perceives the unity of head and heart, of emotion and reason, of thought and feeling as stemming from intelligence. According to Krishnamurti intelligence implies a change of will which means the 'will' of comprehension and it is this which brings about intelligence. In the choice of the word intelligence and the significance that he crystallizes in it he succeeds in conveying a different significance which is not synonymous with intellect when divorced <sup>from</sup> of emotion.

Krishnamurti selects words that are not technical in connotation but familiar, and then tones <sup>them</sup> (it) up to give a deeper meaning. The word intelligence is significant in its own way but Krishnamurti uses it in a deeper sense than is commonly understood. According to Krishnamurti it is the 'will' of comprehension arising out of love that brings about intelligence. There lies the depth of the meaning implied. Intelligence is the completeness of being, the fruition of the life process. It is the action of understanding. "Intelligence is the quality of the mind <sup>18</sup> that is very sensitive, very alert, very aware".

In brief, "Intelligence is the capacity for direct <sup>19</sup> understanding" and knowledge according to Krishnamurti is related to intelligence in that intelligence uses knowledge, it being the capacity to think clearly and

objectively. But while the assimilation of knowledge is perfunctionary in the whole educative process, the intelligence that 'questions' that tries to find out, has to be nurtured in the educative process. Dealing with the thinking process it is the response of memory, knowledge comes from experience. Mankind has thousands of experiences from which it has derived knowledge. Knowledge is memory stored in the mind. If you have no experiences there is no memory and there is no knowledge. There is no complete knowledge of anything since knowledge is always limited. Krishnamurti holds the view that the illusory entity which is created as a direct consequence of the process of naming or terming experience, and then storing or recording it in our consciousness, is the process that gives strength to the illusory entity, the experiencer as distinct and separate from the experience. For Krishnamurti, it cannot be denied that thought is the real cause of human misery since knowledge which is the function of thought gives rise to dependence. Without thoughts there is no thinker. Thoughts create the thinker, who isolates himself to give himself permanency; for thoughts are always impermanent. Krishnamurti speaks of an instant transformation where the entire being, the superficial as well as the hidden, is purged of the past and where the layers of consciousness are ultimately quiet. To Krishnamurti, freedom implies discovery of something

entirely new, and, the function of thought in acquiring knowledge diminishes our capacity for seeing and experiencing something totally different and previously unknown. But "freedom does not exist without order".<sup>20</sup> Knowledge is acquired and accumulated from sources other than the self and it cannot directly help develop intelligence. Knowledge does not necessarily lead to intelligence and being knowledgeable is not necessarily being intelligent. Intelligence according to Krishnamurti is the intense and deep awareness of the entire content of life, the totality of life without preferences or value judgments. "If you have no intelligence, no sensitivity,<sup>21</sup> then knowledge can become very dangerous".

Since knowledge belongs to the past, for it is stored in the memory, time plays an important role in regard to knowledge and memory. The more knowledge is acquired and accumulated the mind becomes burdened and cluttered with information from the past, creating a dependency on the past and in order to understand the nature of such dependence the mind has to be liberated without making any choices. To simply observe and be aware is an exercise in intelligence; and awareness takes place spontaneously when intelligence without choice is exercised: "when choice enters the equation thought makes intelligence<sup>22</sup> dissipate". To observe and be aware is an exercise in

intelligence. The mind does not differentiate between right and wrong. "It simply observes the flow of thought".<sup>23</sup>

Therefore awareness is not a movement of the mind, it only observes the flow of thought and Krishnamurti describes this observation as 'choiceless awareness' which is imperative to the learning dimension and is in itself a movement, not a restful state.

In examining the teaching of Krishnamurti who questions the roots of the present education culture, the real problem is very direct. Much of thinking and the subsequent actions produce conflict which prevents freedom from coming into being. Knowledge gives rise to dependence, and the use of past knowledge disrupts necessary observation in an actual relationship, human or otherwise. Even with a great deal of knowledge the individual has remained the same psychologically. Hence the real problem facing humanity is to become free of conditioning, of beliefs, of dogmas because conditioning results in divisiveness, and where there is divisiveness there is conflict. According to Krishnamurti this awareness of being conditioned is termed<sup>24</sup> as "the factor of intelligence".

Therefore to understand the limitations of thought and to

have an instant perception of 'what is' is to become free of the conditioning that emphasizes thinking comparatively. Krishnamurti points out that thinking in terms of ideals is what creates conflict. It is an instant perception of 'what is' that provides right action. Thus when there is an insight, there is total freedom and learning takes place instantly. Krishnamurti is not referring to usual academic intelligence but to an unique, innate human quality requiring new dimensions and a conceptual framework based on spontaneous insight, in the contemporary educative process. Krishnamurti has pointed out that society is what individuals are because it is created by individuals who are made to conform to the particular culture and socioeconomic and political order within which it exists, so that in this conformity can temporary stability to the society be achieved, even if it deprives the individual the freedom to flower. In Krishnamurti's own words: "The social pattern is set up by man; it is not independent of man, though it has a life of its own, and man is not independent of it; they are interrelated. Change within the pattern is no change at all; it is mere modification, reformation. Only by breaking away from the social pattern without building another can you 'help' society. As long as you belong to society you are only helping it to deteriorate. All societies, including the most marvellously utopian, have within them the seeds of their

own corruption. To change society you must break away from it. You must cease to be what society is: acquisitive, ambitious, power seeking, and so on".<sup>25</sup> It is evident here that what Krishnamurti suggests is not an antagonistic revolt against the structures of society, but in so conforming will result in its deterioration since the acquisitive, ambitious and power seeking pursuits only lead us to comparisons, conflict and divisiveness and the desire 'to be'. Hence to him the problem is not only to break away from society, but to come totally to life again. A habit of comparison and the resulting state of unhappiness begins early in life and comparisons intensify further. This inculcates a spirit of competition, aggressiveness and ultimate violence. Therefore to live without comparison is, according to Krishnamurti, to experience real freedom, and, to nurture and cultivate this freedom should be the function of education. Thus the reversal of the entire system that emphasizes the desire 'to be' is perhaps the true transformation which will lead to extraordinary freedom. Since the habit of thinking in terms of comparison, competition and the desire 'to be' persists, it is only in the riddance of it that learning can begin to gain a wider dimension, and not circumvolve on the accumulation of knowledge and the cluttering of information but on the discovery of something new and unique.

But while the sole pursuit of knowledge leads to continuous evaluation and goal setting, bringing in competition and insecurity, the desire 'to be' then constitutes the cause of insecurity. It is important to grant that knowledge is necessary outside the context of human relationships. But when pre-existing knowledge based on memory is used to establish a relationship it restricts the actual development of a relationship, since concepts are formed from which action is stemmed. If image-making constitutes establishing a relationship then it must pertain only in so far as physical recognition is concerned. The observing and engaging in instant experiences in relationships should be spontaneous. Essentially, an individual must learn to look with a mind that is free to observe. And as long as this association between knowledge and relationship remains a theoretical proposition there is the obvious fact that theories prevent us from looking at the facts as they really are. Therefore the accumulation of information and the acquisition of theories only goes to make the individual dependent on ideas and prescriptions originating elsewhere. Krishnamurti therefore directs his whole purpose of education on learning about oneself. One must start with one self, that is one must learn completely and absolutely about oneself. This entails observing oneself.

When there is dependence on other ideas, theories and

prescriptions, one cannot learn about oneself. And while this sort of dependence is not at all necessary in acquiring knowledge about oneself it is necessary to some degree in the learning of other skills. Krishnamurti conceives self-knowledge as the beginning of wisdom for it implies the spontaneous discernment of the true and the false in the center of one's being which liberates the mind from the illusions of mind and brings about undistorted perception of 'what is' thereby providing the basis for right thinking and consequent right action. Self-knowledge is a process not an end and it cannot be pursued as an objective. According to Krishnamurti it is a constant process of discovery with such time and moment when one can say that 'I have known myself' as in that very assertion lies the negation of self-knowledge.

"To know oneself is to be oneself, and to be oneself is not to desire to be what one is not".<sup>26</sup> And since the self is expressed only in response to the movement of life, it can be discovered only in the mirror of relationship. Self consciousness which arises from an identification with idea and not in the liberation of it, is frequently confused with self-knowledge when the process is pursued as an objective, thereby degrading it to the self-perpetuative action and self seeking action of self consciousness.

The only way to learn about the self is to start with the self learning completely and thoroughly about the self in relationships, reactions, attitudes and orientation without suppression or denial. Such observation about the self leads to further enquiry, to a healthy skepticism, to doubting, questioning and investigating. When we stop reacting to images or to concepts of the past which prejudice our perceptions then, free inquiry can bring us open and liberated minds, free from dependence.

"Observing and not accumulating a great deal of knowledge constitutes learning for right living"<sup>27</sup>. Self knowledge therefore has no set pattern of action, no method and it comes about only in the silent observation of choiceless awareness. It consists of being aware of oneself from moment to moment without any objective. Self knowledge is therefore understood as a way of liberating from the limitations of conditioning and transcending self consciousness and time, thereby marking the awakening of intelligence. It is the way of total action which grasps the individual and society as one single movement of life, and, is capable of creating a new social order which is based on the actions of intelligence.

To Krishnamurti, self knowledge is the way that leads to the discovery of the real. Reality according to him is

ever becoming, creative and eternal and self knowledge is the way of total action which marks the beginning of wisdom and the awakening of intelligence. To Krishnamurti life is essentially action and he identifies energy with pure intelligence, by which he evidently means the unconditioned mind. He says that energy is pure intelligence, and once that is comprehended, then desire has very little significance. Hence it is the incomplete action, the conditioned response that imposes the limitations of individuality and the distortion of perception, due to an accumulation of experience. There are two states of being, that of awakened intelligence and that of ignorance. Memory interferes with intelligence when the mind identifies with sensation and is involved in the idea of self. Ignorance is the conditioning of intelligence and the self is a state of limited intelligence, which is the conditioned self. Conclusively thus, the action of the conditioned mind is the conflict of idea of 'what was' in terms of 'what should be' and 'what is'. The conditioned mind is in conflict with the static identification of the known and the dynamic unknown. Thus "the conditioned is the divided whole; the whole is ever the whole and ever the indivisible".<sup>28</sup> But the conditioned is divided in time, which, using the present as the passage is the continuation of the past into the future. To free the mind of conditioning is to be aware of the process of

identification. Hence conflict is created which is a direct result of the conditioned mind. The contradiction and duality which arise from such conflict is what ultimately creates the inner strife and discontent.

Krishnamurti conceives individuality as conditioned and unconditioned and it is only when, through self knowledge and choiceless awareness, the individual begins to function from intelligence, that fulfillment is attained. This expression of intelligence, which is, intuitive discernment, is totally liberated from self projected illusions, identification and ignorance, since intelligence is total and complete, and a realization of the whole. The freedom from becoming brings forth total freedom, that is freedom from beliefs, dogmas, and superstitions.

Is it possible to be free from all beliefs that purportedly burden the mind while giving it psychological security? The preoccupation with beliefs prevents insights to occur spontaneously. Insight is not a method and although much more is involved the whole is conceived instantly rather than the parts. But the mind must be freed of beliefs before insights can occur spontaneously. Change implies a motive, an objective, a particular orientation of that objective, and at the personal level one must have an insight into what must be done, that is unplanned and

uncharted instead of an agenda of change. An improved educational process and a better society implies social change. The individual is a microcosm of society because of the reciprocal relation between the individual and society, and hence the individual contributes to society and society in turn shapes the individual. Society is not an abstraction and although it is created by man it is possible for one to stand aside and examine its 'status quo'. Individualism, which is limited by society, does not become totally subdued. Infact, since individuals are a part of society, any change in the individual results in changes in society. Since every kind of agenda whether communistic, capitalistic, socialistic, religious or democratic has not brought about any social change, Krishnamurti affirms that only when individuals begin to change and experience the wholeness of life will real change occur in society. Hence individuals who have been conditioned through the educational system must now revolutionize the prevailing educational credo and the 'modus operandi' in the system, so that the whole direction of the educational process might be finally and radically changed. But the crux of the issue is that the change in the individual that brings about social change invariably implies the conception of the divisibility of time. It is the constant awareness of time which prompts action towards achieving a goal. It is the fear of time 'running out'

that causes this intense awareness of time. But according to Krishnamurti if these psychological considerations of security have no reality then there would be a freedom from the fear that time will end. The focus would then shift to change itself. While change implies an agenda, at the level of the individual or society there is instead a freedom of choice prompted by insight. As Krishnamurti puts it, freedom "is not an end, a goal to be achieved. One can never be free in the future. Future freedom has no reality, it is only an idea. Reality is 'what' is; and passive awareness of what 'is' is contentment".<sup>29</sup>

Krishnamurti sees the cumulative process of identification which builds up the self either positively or negatively as a self enclosing activity: "this identifying process prevents the awareness of its own nature".<sup>30</sup> He sees the effort of the self to be or not to be as a force that drives the self into activity while it is at the same time a movement away from what 'is'. There are two kinds of learning: the first is the mere accumulation of knowledge that is used in learning skills; the second kind of learning has the potential for self discovery but it requires a mind free of past impressions; and it is this state of mind that is free and does not stop the process of inquiry and is ultimately ready for insight. While exploring the possibility of insight one may encounter the

problem of conflict, and in the process of seeking solutions to resolve the conflict it may reveal linkage to more and to other kinds of conflict. An insight into a specific kind of problem may not solve everything for all times at a given point, but it is an important beginning. The conflict is not separate from the one who is affected by it, and looks into it for a solution. The conflict is within oneself - envy, greed, the desire 'to be'; and it is this which has created the society we have today. The individual's realization for a good society is the holistic realization of such a society. Krishnamurti sees education as a significant and true way of helping human beings to cultivate the total mind. He plods the comprehensive total approach to life which implies the understanding of what meditation is and what part it has in education. The entire design of thinking is directed towards acquisition, security and not towards experiencing and observing that immeasurable holistic state. In Krishnamurti's words: "If one can unravel what is meditation then the very process of unraveling is meditation".<sup>31</sup> In order to find out what meditation is one has to go into the whole process of thinking. Thinking is a response of memory and thoughts become slave of words and the mind is the word, and it becomes a slave to words, with their nuances and feelings that accompany the words. So the word has tremendous significance. The mind is therefore the word and within

this technical symbolic framework if the mind can separate the word, the symbol, from itself then there is enquiry which does not seek an end and is timeless. Krishnamurti, questions if the mind which is of time and space can explore into a non-spatial, timeless state because it is only in that state that there is creation. For Krishnamurti "a mind that has no space in which to observe has no quality of perception"<sup>32</sup>. How is a mind to enquire into the unknown, the immeasurable? Intelligence, which is not merely the capacity to reason but rather the capacity to perceive is being destroyed by the emphasis on authority, imitation, acceptance, which is mistaken for security. All this implies an extraordinary pliable mind, an intelligence which is not the result of academic education and the acquisition of techniques. According to Krishnamurti, "meditation implies the whole of life, not just the technical, monastic, or scholastic life, but total life and to apprehend and communicate this totality, there must be a seeing of it without space and time. A mind must have in itself a sense of the spaceless and the timeless state.<sup>33</sup> It must see the whole of this picture". Meditation techniques often create a structure, a pattern or a goal. A 'Mantra' is an example of a system that creates a structure. Krishnamurti says that in meditation as also in an academic setting, there must neither be a structure nor an authority. When the mind finds that there

is no authority, no system, no goals and no one single path to follow, no past, present or future this discovery creates a very insecure feeling. But as one finally realizes that one stands steadfastly alone but free then the freedom from becoming brings about total freedom. This discovery has an important implication for education, since the objective of education is holistic. There is not one path to follow to motivate learning; in the absence of authority, systems, goals, and the concepts of the past, present and future, one stands alone as a free person. Learning, then, comes from observing without naming. Learning is looking with curiosity and attentively listening. It is the excitement of discovery and the clarity of insight resulting in immediate perception or reality. Where there is insight, there is not only a total freedom of mind, but total learning. The real significance of meditation lies in being attentive to what is happening around and what is happening inside one's mind. Meditation entails the emptying of everything known from the mind. In order to meditate, to observe the totally new, the mind must be denuded of the known which is the past. According to Krishnamurti, to meditate is to reflect, while paying close attention to what is actually taking place as one does it. One engages in close observation of all that is going on in connection with the actual activity of thought, that being the basic cause of general disorder and chaos in

the mind. The very act of meditation becomes meaningful only when order or emptying of everything known from the mind takes place. It is only then that the confusion surrounding one's consciousness begins to dissipate and the mind becomes very still. It is this state of meditation that sustains mental order and this must be utilized by the educational process to end the chaos and confusion in the mind.

Krishnamurti challenges one to examine one's thought process in order to understand the root cause of inner strife and discontent. According to him, thought is only a material process and the process has to be distinguished from the content; A moment to moment awareness of the content of thought, as well as its process, has to be perceived.

Thus the search for the fundamental values of life must necessarily be directed to resolve the contradictions that exist at the individual level as well as at the social level. The main concern in education is therefore to bridge the division between the subjective and the objective factors of life. Krishnamurti states that unless the individual becomes the center of a tremendously significant revolution, the utter indifference arising out of his feeling of insignificance will continue to be the

cause of disintegration in society. The radical transformation of the individual is what will finally resolve the most fundamental contradictions in society because unless it happens in this order no transformation in society will be effective. The individual and the society are related to each other and it is necessary that man must integrate himself before he can bring about integration in society. Therefore the need to day is for an intergrated philosophy which will create the integrated individual by bringing together the various aspects of his being into a unified 'whole'. The different aspects of his being are but expressions of his innermost experiences. The thoughts, the words, emotions are not mere reactions to outer stimuli but arise out of his innermost individual experiences. The integrated man is not a passive entity but a dynamic force which rises out of his individual experiences in the communion with Truth. Integration is not an intellectual synthesis, a bringing together of parts. Integration is 'wholeness', bringing together the scattered units of one's being into a unified organism. Integration is possible only if the individual can in his routine of work touch the transcendence of Life and at the same time convey its meaning through immanence at different levels. This implies communion with reality in everyday life as well as communication of this communion through channels of expressions at various levels of his being.

This view of life is the intuitive perception of life which comes to the individual experience only when the mind is empty and therefore highly receptive. Intuitive philosophy therefore enriches the forms of the phenomenal world with the transcending of the noumenal realm.

## NOTES

1. R. Mehta, Krishnamurti's Approach to Life: The Intuitive Philosophy, Chetana (P) Ltd., 1988, p. 63.
2. Ibid., p. 59.
3. Intuition as implied here is the knowledge occurring without separation of an interval in time or space i.e. acting or occurring within the medium (of the mind) and without an intervening cause or condition.
4. J. Krishnamurti, Authentic reports of 16 talks given at Oakgrove, Ojai in 1945-1946, Madras, 1947, p. 87.
5. J. Krishnamurti, Talks in Madras in 1952 (Verbatim Report) Madras, 1952, p. 23.
6. J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on Living, I Series, KFI, 1991, p. 69
7. Ibid., p. 69.
8. R.K. Shringy, Philosophy of J. Krishnamurti - A Systematic Study, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers (P) Ltd., 1977, p. 260.
9. Definition (on) Individuality. Individuality in this context is the condition of having a distinct and separate existence or the sum of the characteristics or traits peculiar to an individual.
10. J. Krishnamurti, Talks 1979, KFI Bulletin, 1980, Vol. 2, p. 12.
11. J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on Living, II, KFI, 1991, p. 50.
12. J. Krishnamurti, Talks in New York and Seattle in 1950 (Verbatim Report), Madras, 1950, p. 40.
13. Rohit Mehta, Krishnamurti's Approach to Life: The Intuitive Philosophy, Chetana (P) Ltd, 1988, p. 80.

14. R.K. Shringy, Philosophy of J. Krishnamurti, A Systematic Study, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers (P) Ltd., 1977, p. 221.
  15. Ibid., p. 221.
  16. Ibid., p. 221.
  17. Ibid., p. 221.
  18. J. Krishnamurti, On Education, KFI, 1974, p. 29.
  19. Ibid., p. 29.
  20. Ibid., p. 38.
  21. Ibid., p. 30.
  22. B.B. Khare, J. Krishnamurti, Things of the Mind, Motilal Banarsidass, 1988, p. 4.
  23. Ibid., p. 4.
  24. J. Krishnamurti, On Education, KFI, 1974, p. 35.  
The factor of intelligence: Conditioning is the factor of division and it is the operation of intelligence that makes one aware of the conditioning going on in the mind. It is this intelligence of discerning, the conditioning and the desire to free oneself from this conditioning that Krishnamurti terms as the factor of intelligence. It is only when one is free of conditioning that brings in divisiveness in one's life, that one can live peacefully.
- The significance in education is that everything that the child is taught is registered consciously or unconsciously until he becomes conditioned. And because of this conditioning, he feels differently. He is separate, and where there is separation there is conflict. Hence the child must be free of conditioning in order to live peacefully.
25. J. Krishnamurti, Commentaries on Living, III, KFI, 1991, p. 100.
  26. R.K. Shringy, Philosophy of J. Krishnamurti, A Systematics Study, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers (P) Ltd., 1977, p. 229.
  27. B.B. Kare, J. Krishnamurti, Things of the Mind,

Motilal Banarsidass, 1988, p. 13.

28. R.K. Shringy, Philosophy of J. Krishnamurti, A Systematic Study, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers (P) Ltd., 1977, p. 269.
29. Krishnamurti, J., Commentaries on Living, II Series, KFI, 1991, p. 46.
30. Krishnamurti, J., Commentaries on Living, I Series, KFI, 1991, p. 54.
31. Krishnamurti, J., On Education, KFI, 1974, p. 172.
32. Ibid., p. 173
33. Ibid., p. 177.

## CHAPTER V

### IDEOLOGY IN THE NEXUS OF SOCIAL VALUES

Krishnamurti comprehends Life as a process of consciousness focused in the individual. The manifest universe in which the individual is involved, is therefore a projection of his own consciousness. The fundamental structure of the consciousness of all individuals is based on the same principle. In order to understand the significance of one's involvement in the world of one's creation, one must try to understand the principle involved in the structure of one's consciousness. According to Krishnamurti, it is only then that man can be free from limitations, and transcend the illusion of duality in consciousness. That is why Krishnamurti considers self knowledge to be the beginning of wisdom: "In understanding myself, I shall understand my relationship with another, with the world, for in me, as in each one, is the whole".<sup>1</sup>

It is evident from the above that in the individual is contained the collective, the society, the whole. Therefore according to Krishnamurti to understand life and the significance of existence is to understand oneself as

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

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

R.K. Shringy significantly analysed this relationship between the individual and society when he wrote: "since

the present civilization is the manifestation of action based on idea, action that is self centred and self motivated, the individual identified as he is with the conditions of his being, finds himself in conflict with society; and the society composed as it is of individuals that are ever in competition with each other and are consumed with the desire for power and domination at one level or the other, is ever trying to force the individual to fit into the mould of the group and to reduce him to be a cog in the machine. The conflict between individual and society is the result of the lack of understanding with regard to the true significance of life as an indivisible whole".<sup>2</sup>

The crux of the situation in the social field is the relative importance of the individual and society, whether the society is for the individual or the individual is for the society. For Krishnamurti, life is relationship, and, hence there can be no antagonism between society and individual. What Krishnamurti means by individual is the man who is free from fear and is able to conduct himself intelligently by understanding the laws of life, and, who does not need any institution to make him moral. Krishnamurti looks at the chaos in society as the cumulative result of the individual in contradiction. This reflects in his relationship to other individuals and to

society.

Hence Krishnamurti states that the problem of existence is rooted in consciousness (fragmentation of consciousness) and can only be solved through the 'radical transformation of the psyche' by abolishing the self as the centre of conditioning. Krishnamurti firmly believes that all human problems can be eliminated if our life and action can surface above the limitations of class, creed, national and religious consciousness that divide the world. Hence in very simple terms, 'fragmentation of consciousness', which Krishnamurti speaks of, is a process that has been cultivated by societies through the ages and has culminated to a point where each one is for himself and is therefore in conflict with the other. Self knowledge is the solution that Krishnamurti offers in one's perception of the true. Krishnamurti assigns the field of thought (understanding the significance of life) to individual action; and the field of physical existence (in organizing the necessities of existence) for collective action. As he notes: "That is in the field of thinking and feeling you must not set up another as a guide, but be integrally alone, whereas in work you must plan together, collectively for a living. Therein lies the remedy. It is by the expression of individuality in its rightful place that you can find freedom which is truth; and in the realisation of the truth

3

you will solve your social and economic problems".

Fragmentation of consciousness has arisen as a result of identification with idea. According to Krishnamurti the individual must stop the process of identification. This is what he terms as mutation of mind. It is only the voluntary perception of the truth about 'what is' that can bring about this mutation of mind. No extent of persuasion, or influence through hope or fear or through compulsion can bring about this mutation of mind. Hence to Krishnamurti, no organisation and no method is required for bringing about this change and hence no authority, either of tradition or of a guru is necessary. In fact it is this particular approach that has aroused misunderstanding among those who are not acquainted with Krishnamurti's language. Some of the misunderstandings arise mainly out of misconceptions. It must be understood that Krishnamurti is not against learning from books, or tradition, or gurus or systems of thought. He only cautions against reliance on any of these as an authority. According to Krishnamurti, subservience to authority in any form breeds conformity and delays the 'awakening of intelligence', as Krishnamurti states : "action based on reward and punishment, influence or pressure inevitably brings about conflict".<sup>4</sup>

Krishnamurti is against any form of stimulation, pressure

or influence since these are only external factors and do not help one to actually learn about oneself. As he points out: "when you study and learn about yourself, there comes an extraordinary strength based on clarity, which can withstand all the nonsense of the establishment. This strength is not a form of resistance or self centred obstinacy, or, will, but is a diligent observation of the outer and the inner".<sup>5</sup>

Krishnamurti places self-knowledge at the centre of his teachings. It may appear that he gives too much importance and emphasis to the individual and that he has a lack of concern for society. Krishnamurti sees the individual as being significantly responsible for bringing about a radical social transformation. According to Krishnamurti: "the older the civilization, the greater the weight of tradition with its series of imitations; and being burdened with this weight your mind is never free".<sup>6</sup> Thus the whole of life is hedged in with the limitations of certain ideas. According to Krishnamurti, books, teachers, parents, the society, "tell us what to think, but they never help us to find out how to think. To know what to think is comparatively easy, because from early childhood our minds are conditioned by words, by phrases, by established attitudes and prejudices".<sup>7</sup>

Krishnamurti cautions against an educational system that is directed towards the acquisition of knowledge since it only leads to a mechanistic way of life with the mind functioning along narrow grooves leading to "a mental standardisation, and so, gradually, the state, even a democratic state, dictates what we should become".<sup>8</sup> The result is that freedom is endangered. What Krishnamurti refers to is not freedom which deals with opinion or prejudice but, as Krishnamurti says, with a "non verbal understanding of the implications and consequences of the mind. This flowering is the total unfoldment and cultivation of our minds, our hearts and our physical well being. That is to live in complete harmony in which there is no opposition or contradiction between them. The flowering of the mind can take place only when there is clear perception, objective, non personal, unburdened by any kind of imposition upon it. It is not what to think but how to think clearly".<sup>9</sup>

Krishnamurti forcefully points out the importance of developing the mind, "a mind which is capable of dealing with the many issues of life as a whole, and which does not try to escape from them and so become self-contradictory, frustrated, bitter or cynical".<sup>10</sup> Since the development of the mind is the chief concern, how one teaches is very significant to the whole process of teaching and learning

in schools. Hence Krishnamurti points out that "there must be a cultivation of the totality of the mind, and not merely the giving of information. In the process of imparting knowledge, the educator has to invite discussion and encourage the students to inquire and to think independently".<sup>11</sup>

Krishnamurti speaks of a concerted effort between individuals and society to bring about the right kind of education: "the kind of education that will produce a new generation capable of dealing with the issues of life as a whole and not as isolated parts unrelated to the whole".<sup>12</sup>

Krishnamurti founded schools in India viz at Rishi Valley (in Andhra Pradesh) and Rajghat (at Benares); and Brockwood Park in England, the Oak Grove School at Ojai, California and the Wolf Lake School in Canada. The objective of these schools is in Krishnamurti's own words: "not only to be excellent, academically but much more. They are to be concerned with the cultivation of the total human being. These centres of education must help the student and the educator to flower naturally".<sup>13</sup> Krishnamurti's main objective in the schools that he started is to: "bring about intelligence, if that is possible. The word 'intelligence' means having the faculty of understanding - to understand not only each other, but also what

cooperation means, what freedom, what discipline and order  
14  
mean".

So education is to create an intelligence which is not mere instinct or desire, but an intelligence that will function in this world. Krishnamurti believes that education is meant to prepare oneself to face the world which is crowded with problem situations which are not only economic, social environmental, but also problems of relationship, of how to live intelligently and not be smothered, corrupted by society. Krishnamurti asserts here that : "Education becomes of the greatest importance. Education being not merely the acquisition of technical knowledge, but the understanding, with sensitivity and intelligence, of the whole problem of living - that is the whole structure of human existence".  
15

Krishnamurti is not dealing with specific problems of life related to specific cultures. He is concerned with the universal human predicament. Most significant is Krishnamurti's rejection of the present social order, in so far as it is viewed as being corrupt, and the attempt to reorient the individual in the new social context which is the result of a radical transformation of the psyche. Krishnamurti is emphatic on this point, namely that the only revolution that can transform society is the

revolution that begins within the individual. Political, economic or social revolutions have only produced appalling tyrannies. Krishnamurti speaks of a revolution which is entirely different and which must take place if the individual is to emerge from the endless series of anxieties, conflicts and frustrations. He says: "This revolution has to begin, not with theory and ideation, which eventually prove worthless, but with a radical transformation in the mind itself. Such transformation can be brought about only through right education and the total development of the human being. It is a revolution that must take place in the whole of the mind and not merely in thought".

16

Most educators agree that education is more than the accumulation of knowledge and that it includes the moral, spriritual, affective and physical capabilities as well. Few, however see the whole educational process as a radical transformation of the psyche. Although contemporary educational programmes have taken in other aspects of learning, it has nevertheless remained a knowledge accumulation process. Krishnamurti believes that it is only through education that a change in society can be brought about. Tragically enough what is in fact happening in education is the reverse - the disintegration of the individual is bringing about the disintegration of society.

The radical transformation that Krishnamurti talks about involves understanding the nature of conditioning and the relationship of the individual to his environment. According to Krishnamurti, change is, dying to the past. When such change does not take place then education leads to a perpetuation of tradition. Hence the two important points to be considered here are: firstly, the emphasis Krishnamurti places on the cultivation of the 'inner', on the integration of consciousness and psychological change. Secondly Krishnamurti points to the destructively conformist function of modern education. The 'socialisation' in schools is seen as being the transmitters of culture and tradition and is given great emphasis in the curriculum. In return, it dominates the actual learning process and the schools remain inherently conservative institutions helping to perpetuate the status quo. Of course Krishnamurti is not the only one to observe this, and a similar critique is put forward by neo-Marxist sociology. Neo-Marxists point towards a symbiosis between schools and society at large and indicate how dominant social groups maintain their positions through the ideological and cultural reification occurring in the school. They point to the curriculum as being an instrument of ideological hegemony reproducing certain socio-economic patterns.<sup>17</sup> Hence It is apparent how schools reproduce and legitimize the status quo. Another

criticism from the Neo Marxist point is the way in which schools select and organize the curriculum towards the objective of perpetuating a competitive and stratified society. Schools not only process the individual but also the knowledge that he must acquiesce and in this way the individual is conditioned for acceptance and to acquiescing in the existing social order. There is no freedom for seeking alternatives to the values and cultural ethos.<sup>18</sup> Hence the value neutral and the so called apolitical atmosphere of schools disguises the reproductionist and legitimating functions of schools. Schools according to Krishnamurti condition rather than integrate the individuals' consciousness. It is this dependence on schools to learn, which in later life, becomes the need to be fed, clothed and entertained, that Krishnamurti is against. Krishnamurti distinguishes between the feeling of being secure and the feeling of dependency, and says that: "consciously or unconsciously, most educators cultivate the feeling of dependency, and thereby subtly encouraged fear - which the parents also do in their own affectionate or aggressive manner".<sup>19</sup> The dogmatic or authoritarian assertions on the part of the parents or the teachers as to what the child must be and do, is what creates this dependency in the child. According to Krishnamurti, with dependency there is always the shadow of fear, and this fear compels the child to obey, to conform, to accept

without thought the edicts and sanctions of his elders. In  
this atmosphere of dependency, sensitivity is crushed".<sup>20</sup>  
The child must feel secure, and the impact of the  
relationship based on confidence will help towards a  
natural communication free of fear. Krishnamurti says that  
"being at ease, feeling secure, the child will do what he  
likes; but in doing what he likes he will find out what is  
the right thing to do, and his conduct then will not be due  
to resistance, or obstinacy, or suppressed feelings...".<sup>21</sup>

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

An unplanned dimension of the curriculum as distinct from  
the planned or visible aspect which has a strong cognitive  
bias is termed as the hidden curriculum which includes such

diverse factors as students extra curricular interests, peer group pressures and values, social values, personality traits - in short, the various environmental and psychological factors. In fact such a curriculum positively motivates the students and constitutes part of an exciting and refreshing learning adventure. It is important for the educator to know what each student brings into a learning situation so that learning can become meaningful. It is when the focus shifts from these aspects of a hidden curriculum by a near exclusive emphasis on the planned curriculum which is predominantly knowledge based, that the individualised factors are sacrificed to conformity and standardization. In all this, the individual student and what A.Hook<sup>22</sup> appropriately terms as the psychological dimension of the curriculum is ignored.

Krishnamurti looks at this situation in terms of the conscious and unconscious mind which he refers to in this context as the superficial mind and the hidden mind: "The hidden mind is far more vital than the superficial. Most educators are concerned only with giving information or knowledge to the superficial mind, preparing it to acquire a job and adjust itself to society. So the hidden mind is never touched. All that so called education does is to super impose a layer of knowledge and technique, and a certain capacity to adjust to environment".<sup>23</sup>

Although the neo-Marxist analysis of the hidden curriculum is more complete than most other theories, it however does not look into the psycho-sociological nexus of conditioning. As a result of this the whole mechanism of cultural reproduction cannot be explained. What the neo-Marxist theory asserts is that schools are the grounds on which the dominant interest groups project their ideology and are thus able to retain their supremacy and power. However, they do not explain how this process manipulates and suppresses the individual so effectively and in a very subtle manner. The neo-Marxist view does not take into account the psychological factors involved in this cycle of reproduction, and since they missed the critical aspect of the socialisation process, they cannot see how knowledge then conditions the individual. They cannot see how knowledge per se conditions and fragments consciousness which then serves the interests of the dominant groups by producing an uncreative and indifferent population. As M.W. Apple,<sup>24</sup> for example, argues, that schools accept a 'consensus' view of knowledge and the world rather than a 'conflict' view which he sees necessary for students to create their own knowledge rather than assimilate what is given to them.

Krishnamurti looks at intelligence as "the capacity to deal with life as a whole; and giving grades or marks to the

student does not assure intelligence. On the contrary it degrades human dignity. This comparative evaluation cripples the mind - which does not mean that the teacher must not observe the progress of every student and keep a record of it".<sup>25</sup>

Krishnamurti affirms that any spirit of comparison prevents this full flowering of the individual. He says that "when comparison comes in, then there is the disparagement and the envious reactions which create conflict ..."<sup>26</sup> He further points out that : "giving marks, grading, comparing and any form of computing, either through kindness or through threats, breed fear; and it is because we are caught in this fear while we are young that we struggle in fear for the rest of our life"<sup>27</sup>. This has a tremendously stagnant effect on education for as Krishnamurti points out: "Learning implies freedom, curiosity, inquiry. When a child learns something, he is curious about it, he wants to know, it is a free momentum; not a momentum of having acquired and of moving from that acquisition"<sup>28</sup>.

Krishnamurti believes that the old order must change giving rise to the new as "the older people, by their attitude towards life, create a form of education which is merely a repetition of the old, so there is no new way of living"<sup>29</sup>. Krishnamurti believes that any radical or innovative

changes in education could come only if regenerative ideas were instilled in the young minds. As he succinctly puts it: "That is why it seems to me very important to think about all these matters while you are still very young ... when there is no fear, you study much better. When you feel that you are not being compelled to anything, you will find out what you are interested in and then for the rest of your life you will do something which you really love to do ... if you really love to do something with your hands and with your mind, then through that love you will create a new world. But you cannot create a new world if you are frightened, and therefore while you are young there must be a spirit of revolt".<sup>30</sup> It is with this spirit of adventure that Krishnamurti started his institutional ventures.

<sup>31</sup>  
Thapan M. examines the relationship between ideology, school and society. She does this by examining a particular case, that of the Rishi Valley school (RVS) which is inspired by the educational philosophy of Krishnamurti. A systematic study follows within an overall sociological framework that takes into account the school as an organization, and also the social world of the students and teachers. The social reality of the school is constructed through the teachers' and students' understanding of the perceptions of the School and what it stands for, a perception of their respective rolls and of

one another in the school ambient.

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

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

Among the important observations that Thapan makes of the RVS as a socio-cultural-educational venture is the class of ideologies in school processes. Since there are two

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

Thapan has intelligently sifted the value system of a particular mentality of Indian society who patronise RVS and the overall world view of the school. While their background has ingrained in them the competitive spirit and a goal oriented perspective, the ideology of the school emphasizes a different kind of learning, pointing to an alternative world view. This gives rise to a conflict, in the minds of the pupils. This conflict, according to her observation, is also reflected in other areas of school life and in the students views of, and, about the school process. It is obvious that schools do not exist in a vacuum and RVS is no exception. Schools have to function in an interaction with the external environment which often

does not correspond with the school ideology and may result in contrary pressures on school processes. A striking observation made by Thapan is that RVS is dependent on the affluent middle and upper classes for its maintenance as a result of which it has to accommodate and incorporate the values and norms of these classes in its functioning.

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

Since the other public schools have implicit ideologies only tacitly expressed, they do not experience similar

problems as their ideology does not interfere with the institutional structure (of the school) or with the routine school processes. In fact the ideology in these schools is accommodated to suit the structure and functioning of such schools.

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

At another level, the culture of the school is made up of the rituals and ceremonies that constitute school life, including the rituals of every day life that are rooted in the academic system, such as tests and examinations. Thapan analyses both the routinized and dramatized rituals in order to verify the configuration of values as well as the organizational and discursive practice that governs the culture of the school. For instance, the relative lack of authoritarian element in the teacher-pupil relationship

which as was pointed out by Thapan, does present difficulties to the teachers, may be otherwise viewed merely as the outcome of a more general progressive ideology based on a democratic pattern.

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

The study has also not broached the question of the schools specific value system and the existing social norms and values. Thapan could have given a broader and more meaningful perspective to the study of RVS through a comparative review of other schools (public) with different ideologies. This would give a better understanding at observing how different kinds of ideologies operate through

school processes.

The apparent difficulties that Thapan faces in assessing the extent to which the ideology is successful in attaining its goals through education is quite evident. In Krishnamurti's ideology the transformation of the psyche of the individual is what is termed as 'change' and the measurement of the extent to which such radical transformation has on the future of society is elusive to a great extent.

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

As also indicated by Thapan, in 'Life at School', a school does not exist in a vacuum, apart from its community. Parental support helps create and sustain the school, particularly its atmosphere. The children bring to the learning situation the moral and social values of the parents. Along with this, they also bring in their expectations of the school, and this influences the whole climate of learning. It is important to involve parents in a healthy network of communication between the teacher,

pupil and parent. Parents have the most influence on the up-bringing of their children and it is important that the responsibility is not shifted entirely to the teacher so that together they can aspire for the fulfillment of the child within the educational set up, and, free from conflicting currents. The cooperation between teachers and parents is important to the progress of any educational effort, and parents can assist the movement of self-knowledge by their own commitment and readiness to investigate their relationship with the child.

Krishnamurti looks apprehensively at a situation where perhaps the greatest difficulty the educator has to face is the indifference of parents to a wider and deeper education. He says: "Most parents are concerned only with the cultivation of some superficial knowledge which will secure their children respectable positions in a corrupt society. So the educator not only has to educate the children in the right way, but also to see to it that the parents do not undo whatever good may have been done at the school. Really the school and the home should be joint centres of right education, and should in no way be opposed to each other, with the parents desiring one thing and the educator doing something entirely different".<sup>32</sup> It is therefore very important that the parents be fully acquainted with what the educator is doing and be vitally

interested in the total development of the child.

The physical environment is an important factor in creating the atmosphere of learning. Krishnamurti suggests situations which are close to nature, open and harmonious where children can develop their sensitivity and freedom. How space is managed in a learning situation is very important to the effectiveness of the teaching and learning effort. In a rigid classroom plan where children are fixed to rows and desks facing the teacher, their relationship with the teacher is immediately locked into one of subservience rather than equality. According to Krishnamurti: "Authority, as the one who knows, has no place in learning. The educator and the student are both learning through their special relationship with each other".<sup>33</sup> But by this very casual attitude it does not mean that the educator disregards the orderliness of thought. As Krishnamurti says: "Orderliness of thought is not brought about by discipline in the form of assertive statements of knowledge; but it comes into being naturally when the educator understands that in cultivating<sup>34</sup> intelligence there must be a sense of freedom". Krishnamurti goes into the detail of explaining the nature of freedom. He says: "It is the freedom in which the student is being helped to be aware of his own urges and motives, which are revealed to him through his daily

thought and action".

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

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

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

appropriately in the small class unit).

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

Krishnamurti advocates the need for an open, less structured or even unstructured education. To help bring about a good society, dogmatic adherence to outmoded aspects of education have to be pushed aside. Krishnamurti points out to the fact that society is what individuals are. Rousseau too believed that society was created by individual and not vice versa. J.J. Rousseau<sup>36</sup> brings out the essence of the meaning of social education in Emile (Published in 1762) where he emphasizes individual based learning for children by teaching them about nature and shows how the process of learning would take place through discovery. Emile would not require any of the formal teaching required by society. Rousseau wanted Emile to be similar to man in his original, natural self: solitary,

experiencing freedom and strengthening the physical body to prepare the way for the mind. This education would involve practical knowledge. Rousseau and Krishnamurti have many similar views with regard to education. Like Rousseau, Krishnamurti too believed that freedom from the educator's thought processes is the key to ensuring achievement of their natural growth. Many of the ideas of Froebel seem to have permeated the educational ideas of Krishnamurti. Like Froebel, Krishnamurti too believed in the value of childhood not as a transitory phase to adulthood, but a status in itself which possessed its own dimension of creativeness. Froebel believed that the child and adult must establish relationship of pure understanding and mutual respect. Krishnamurti too believed that the educator and the student are both learning, through their special relationship with each other. Froebel advocated the inner relatedness of all education and Krishnamurti states that: "The whole movement of life is learning. There is never a time in which there is no learning. Every action is a movement of learning and every relationship is learning"<sup>37</sup> one cannot but feel a tremendous impact of the meaning of the learning process, and interpret it with what Froebel articulates about the inner relatedness in education and the totality of learning. To Krishnamurti education: "should help you to prepare for life. You may become a clerk, or a Governor or a Scientist, but that is

not the whole of life.

Again, like Montessori, Krishnamurti believed that education must lead to the complete unfolding of the child's individuality and that self education is the only true education.

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

NOTES

1. J. Krishnamurti, Authentic reports of 10 Talks given at Ojai in 1944, pp. 16-17.
2. K. R. Shringy, Philosophy of J. Krishnamurti, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd. 1977, pg. 361.
3. Krishnamurti as quoted by Lily Heber, Krishnamurty, and the world Crisis, P. 231.
4. J. Krishnamurti, Letters to the schools, KFI, 1981 p. 100.
5. Ibid. p. 100.
6. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI 1992, Pg. 33.
7. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI 1992, P. 48.
8. J. Krishnamurti, Letters to the Schools, KFI 1981, p. 8.
9. Ibid. p. 8.
10. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI 1992, p. 8.
11. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI, 1992, p.8.
12. Ibid. p. 21.
13. J. Krishnamurti, Letters to Schools, p. 7.
14. J. Krishnamurti, Beginnings of Learning, Penguin Books, 1986, p. 47.
15. J. Krishnamurti, Beginnings of Learning, Penguin Books, 1986, p.55.
16. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI, 1992, p.7.
17. P.W.Musgrave, and R.J.W. Shelleck, Alternative Schools, Hong Kong, J. Wiley & Sons, 1975, p. 102.
18. Value Neutral is a term much in use at present, in an educational setting.
19. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI 1992, p. 12.
20. Ibid. p. 12.

21. Ibid. p. 13
22. A. Hook, *The awakening of intelligence, K. Krishnamurti's approach to education.* Dissertation for the degree of B.Ed. (Hons) of Murdoch University, 1984).
23. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI 1992, p. 22-23.
24. M.W. Apple, Ideology and Curriculum, Rontledge and Kegan paul, London, 1979, p.88.
25. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI, 1992, p.11.
26. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI, 1992, pp. 9-10.
27. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI, 1992, p.150.
28. J. Krishnamurti, The Impossible Question, Arkana 1972, p. 82.
29. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI 1992, p. 150.
30. Ibid. pp. 150-151.
31. M. Thapan, Life at School, and Ethnographic Study, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1991.
32. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI, 1992, p.11.
33. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI, 1992, p.9.
34. Ibid. p. 9.
35. Ibid. p. 9.
36. Emile, London: Everyman's Library, 1911.
37. J. Krishnamurti, *Letters to Schools*, KFI, 1981, p.22.
38. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI, 1992, p. 147-148.
39. J. Krishnamurti, Life Ahead, KFI 1992, p.166.b

## CONCLUSION

### THE SECOND LAST WORD

In this summing up, Krishnamurti's philosophical ideas<sup>s</sup> are examined and the nature of the educational perspective upon which his educational ideas have crystallized, is reviewed.

Krishnamurti is radically different from most philosophers in that he has opposed the tendency to frame his insights and philosophical ideas into a system, a theory or a doctrine. Suffice it to say that his philosophical ideas have much in common with different schools of thought such as existentialism, idealism and even rationalism. The 'humanism' in all those philosophies has influenced his thought. All educational philosophies stress on some kind of humanism. Humanism has become a theory of its own without its adherents necessarily following any particular philosophical or psychological system.

Krishnamurti shares the view with humanists that education should be more human centered in its scope. It should use all the ideas of the past and the present so that there is a better understanding of the human predicament.

Humanists have strongly endorsed a humanistic curriculum in the educational field which focuses upon interests, concerns and problems that are common to all.

Krishnamurti has drawn the essence of 'humanism' which dominates the principal idea in all the philosophies, and created a new dimension in learning.

As one listens to Krishnamurti's well articulated discourses, one is struck by his genuine concern for the human condition. His talks have little of the manner in which speakers generally speak, as, his discourses are exercises in self-analysis. Krishnamurti's totally unconventional approach issues from the fact that he is not concerned about expounding a theory or formulating a concept.

Many are of the opinion that his philosophical thinking may be connected with the Indian tradition. His way of expression is free from all the traditional terminology of the Indian philosophical genius and he addresses the contemporary mind in modern terms, not coloured by eastern or western cultural hues.

Important philosophical theories, such as Idealism, Realism, Pragmatism, Reconstructionism, Existentialism and

theories of Behaviourism, Liberal Education and Progressivism were reviewed. These discussions were attempted in an effort to relate the philosophical concepts to educational practice in general, while concurrently attempting to analyse Krishnamurti's educational ideas which formed the basis of the schools founded by him.

To attempt to construct Krishnamurti's educational ideas and objectives without an intellectually guiding frame of reference is, to say the least, an exercise in futility.

Krishnamurti attempts to sift the essence from the various philosophical systems and by abstracting the important elements, bring about an intelligible whole which nolens volens leads to a theory in its own right.

Most idealists have a deep feeling about the inner powers of an individual, such as intuition, that must be accounted for in any true education. Much of the educational practice is feeding a person intellectually rather than bringing out the truths that already exist within man. Education can be conceived, as not only consisting of the dialectic, but also the technique of meditation to bring out truths already possessed by the soul. As for Krishnamurti, meditation is important in education since it is a process of self-discovery, an all inclusive awareness of 'what is'. Effortless living is, according to

Krishnamurti, living in meditation.

Idealists do not favour specialized learning as much as learning that is holistic. Krishnamurti too regarded education in terms of a wholistic approach in learning.

Hegel the philosopher who dared to draw into one philosophical system, the entire development of the universe, brings forward the theory that the whole has a logic greater than the sum of its parts. The subject has to be approached by seeing it in totality where all the factors influencing it are present. This is the level of the whole. The part can only be understood in terms of its place within the whole. Considering that wholes and parts are relative, parts are wholes in themselves and wholes are parts of greater wholes. We must continually adjust our focus. Any issue can only be comprehended in totality. This holistic state of mind may not be like the holistic state of mind that Krishnamurti refers to when he talks about the fragmentation of thought. For Krishnamurti thought is a product of the past and it cannot be totally aware of a fact in the present. It can only operate in terms of the past or the future. This characteristic of thought has to be clearly understood as it creates conflict. Krishnamurti states that contradiction arises only when the mind has a fixed desire and makes that a

permanent objective. This places the individual in a state of 'becoming'. He reaches one level of gratification only to desire another. Krishnamurti clarifies this by explaining that mind is the product of Time, and thought is coloured by the past already captured by the mind and it looks to the future for achieving objectives. The result is contradiction. The idea of thinking in the present without recourse to the thought processes of the past and the future is the single most important theme in Krishnamurti's teaching.

Locke and Francis Bacon were the most outstanding realist thinkers. Locke was an empiricist and his recognition that a child should not be pushed beyond his ability and readiness is very scientific and contemporary. In practice realism is rigid and it has an operant factor for order and precision. Krishnamurti's idea of school activity balances between the rigidity in the learning situation, and Locke's view that children should make their progress according to their ability and readiness.

As pragmatism is reviewed it is seen that the pragmatists are for action oriented education and problem solving abilities. They prefer methods that are flexible and endorse a more general education as opposed to narrow specialization. Krishnamurti believes that a child should

feel at ease in a school and also he should be secure. Being at ease, feeling secure, the child will do what he likes best. For Krishnamurti, education is meant to facilitate one to deal with life as a whole.

While reconstructionists feel that educational programmes should help students to become 'agents of change', Krishnamurti advocates change in the manner of a radical transformation of the psyche which will bring about change in the social order. Hence in essence, he bears the view of the reconstructionists in relation to the need for change as harbingers of a new social order.

All along in the study of Krishnamurti's ideas it was seen that to Krishnamurti the individual is the focus for educational programmes. Existentialists have a great concern for the role of the individual in life and they believe that it is from individuals that all ideas, values and institutions come forth. This is a different view from the Idealist view that holds that all ideas are in a real, pre-existing form and independent from man, and it is the individual who then discovers ideas. For the existentialist, the individual creates the ideas. Krishnamurti defines creative thinking as the infinite movement of thought, emotion and action. When thought is unimpeded in its movement, and is not bound by an idea nor

does it arise from the background of tradition or habit, then that movement is creative. Just as the existentialists urge us to break away from superficiality and uncommitted action, Krishnamurti also suggests that we examine our lives, and desires; and he suggests the method of introspection as a guide to self knowledge. Just as the existentialists are seeking to open the awareness to human potential and human possibilities in the modern world, so also Krishnamurti points in the direction of the cultivation of the total mind.

Krishnamurti's ideas often identify with Marxism and like the Marxists, Krishnamurti also is of the idea that much of what passes for present education is really indoctrination to enslave the masses to existing economic, political and social systems. The hidden curriculum teaches docility and subservience to the present system and such education, Krishnamurti believes, must be eradicated if we are to prevent exploitation and move toward a world of economic and social justice. In order to do this, students must be exposed to new and radical points of view and encouraged to become agents of change in building a better society.

Marx in his study of utopian socialism arrived at a detailed criticism of bourgeois society as one that went against the principles of humanism. Krishnamurti considers

man and society as inter related. According to Krishnamurti, all societies, even the most utopian have within their structure the seeds of their own degeneration and only by breaking away, from the social pattern without building another can one help society. What would a new society be like? Marx describes communism as a society of genuine and complete humanism that offers all its members the possibility of all round development. Krishnamurti also believes that society must be humanistic if the individual has to develop to the fullest. The radical difference between the two, however, is that for Marx, it is 'society' first and foremost that would be humanistic, whereas, for Krishnamurti, it is the individual.

Again while Marx who was determined to link theoretical speculation with real life, made a thrust in politics, Krishnamurti on the other hand combined philosophy with reality by projecting into the educational field. Since Krishnamurti has never articulated on the numerous philosophical trends, the exercise of examining the ideas contained in these philosophies is purely at the hypothetical level making it almost impossible to pin him down within a conceptual framework of any philosophy.

As the focus in this discussion shifts to Behavioural theories, Skinner's views on the educational process is one

of the main modes of designing a culture through positive reinforcements. Behaviourists suggest the use of behavioural methods in education as well as in social life. Skinner for example has experimented in the area of social and cultural reform. The behaviourists belief is that behaviour is caused by environmental factors making it possible to engineer more effectively the kinds of people and social conditions in the modern world.

Until man can free himself from conditioning, Krishnamurti says, there can be no freedom nor peace. But this thought process cannot end until we realise the basis from which it originated. According to Krishnamurti 'any reaction is conditioned' and 'through conditioning there can be no freedom either at the beginning or at the end - and freedom is always at the beginning (and not at the end!). Hence if our reactions are all conditioned, the first freedom then is the internal revolution which man must go through in order to free his thinking from this state in which it has become imprisoned. And until man tries to achieve this freedom from within, there can be no way of obtaining the second freedom which is the freedom from inhibition. When this is achieved it leads to the understanding of, and the respect for others, and consequently there is a willingness to cooperate. Self-centeredness is replaced with an interest in others.

•

Krishnamurti points towards a change in society from a radically different perspective. Since man and society are interrelated, in order to change society, man must break away from it and cease to be acquisitive, ambitions and power seeking.

Krishnamurti's ideas of education seem to have been also based on liberal education which is neither vocational, nor scientific not even specialized education. Krishnamurti's education is based on the nature of knowledge itself. In this concept, education is based on what is true and it therefore has a finality which no other form of education has. Besides, liberal education has a value which has nothing to do with utilitarian concerns. And finally, because of the significance of knowledge in the determination of life as a whole, liberal education is essential to man's understanding of how he ought to live, both individually and socially.

Liberal education is concerned with the comprehensive development of the mind in acquiring knowledge. Curricula cannot therefore be constructed in terms of information and isolated skills but as interrelated aspects of each of the several disciplines thereby covering at least in some measure, the range of knowledge as a whole. Though its aim is comprehensive it is not after the acquisition of

information. Krishnamurti thought of education on these very lines and he did not believe that cluttering the mind with information was the main objective of education.

In Krishnamurti's teachings, one constantly comes across an emphasis on the whole of life, rather than on its academic, technical or utilitarian aspects. In order to understand this totality, a mind must have within itself a sense of spacelessness and timelessness. Krishnamurti teaches that what is absolutely important is the awakening of the 'integrated intelligence' of the individual. According to Krishnamurti, at present life has been divided into compartments and hence education has little meaning. Education as we know has led the individual to see life as a fragmented series of events rather than seeing the whole of life. As far as education does not help to cultivate an integrated outlook, it has very little meaning. Thus to understand the meaning of a holistic education, one must understand the significance of the wholeness of life. To most, wholeness of life is not of vital importance since the educational institution emphasizes on the secondary values of making the individual proficient in academic or technical knowledge. Education is not merely a matter of training the mind. Training leads to efficiency but it does not bring about completeness. And according to Krishnamurti, a mind that has been subjected only to

training becomes more efficient, but it does not bring about completeness. A mind that has been incessantly trained, in a way, perpetuates the past, but cannot traverse the paths of the new and unexplored field of knowledge.

In order to reorient education towards a 'holistic' end Krishnamurti redirects the movement of education towards an understanding of the whole meaning of life. It is only by understanding oneself that one can understand the meaning of a holistic life. This is Krishnamurti's primary objective in education.

To Krishnamurti, an awareness of life as a whole is the first step towards the understanding of one self. To know and understand one self according to Krishnamurti means to know one's relationship with nature, ideas, material objects, people and everything else that surrounds and makes up the world. The way Krishnamurti perceives this situation is that man is not really aware of anything as it truly is - and he is only aware of the responses to an external stimulus. In his words, there is immediate response through sensation, followed by contact, then identification and finally with desire or aversion. The critical stage is the identification where one develops a capacity to identify a stimulus with pleasure or with pain

i.e. to desire things that give pleasure and to avoid ideas, persons or things that give pain. Krishnamurti states that to understand oneself in these terms is to limit the scope of understanding. But when one is able to regard things without identifying either with pain or pleasure, i.e. without interpretation, without judgement, without condemnation, without comparison then only can one begin to understand oneself. If one can learn to be aware of things as they truly are, one can then learn to understand the whole process of thinking. Krishnamurti calls this 'passive awareness'. That is if one must be aware of things as they truly are one cannot be aggressively (or passively) involved with it, or question it or speculate about it. But one must be alert to the stimuli and be able to see things truly and be aware of things as they really are.

According to Krishnamurti, when one achieves total awareness then there is a release from conditioning and from the symbols of identification of pain and pleasure. There is also a release from the choice of right and wrong. Hence the individual has a clear mind which simply does not choose but accepts the 'what is' of things. In the educational perspective it is important to make the individual face up to a problem with this approach. Unfortunately, the educational institutions groom the

individual to deal with the problems by drawing upon past education and experience, by making the old pattern fit into the new problem situation and thereby hope to resolve it.

The progressivist emphasize the need for problem solving in education. They are of the view that problem solving is a learned activity and therefore a good problem solver, is the one best equipped to face life's problems. In the same line of thought, Krishnamurti says that he who is in confusion, chooses 'what he shall or shall not do', but he who has a clear mind accepts what is as 'what is'. The progressivists however also emphasize workability i.e. by learning the techniques of problem solving, the individual will be in a position to find those things that work to make his life more effective. Different from Krishnamurti's view is the progressivists' view of promoting a democratic approach to learning as the best possible way of changing society in an intelligent and humane way. This is a more liberal approach to social change as compared to the reconstructionists' more radical approach of promoting immediate social change even if existing social institutions must be changed or overthrown!.

Krishnamurti's educational ideas seem to be free of culture

specific relatedness as was evident in most of the contemporary philosophies of education discussed earlier in this study. There is neither the Indian cultural ethos nor western ideological moorings in his articulation thereby making it both, universal and humanistic in character. Krishnamurti makes no commitments to any political or social ideologies and his educational ideas have a transcultural dimension and tremendous universal impact. On the Indian scenario, philosophers like Vivekananda, Tagore, Gandhi and others have revealed strong traditional and cultural determinants although their educational theories are apparently seen as having strong universal appeal.

Krishnamurti is primarily concerned with the psychological sense of the 'self', i.e. the sense of I-ness, which is the result of identification with a set of conditions, which in turn condition intelligence and obstructs it from the 'wholeness of life'. Krishnamurti explains how a deep sense of insecurity underlies the sense of 'self', which, compounded by psychological pain, accumulated over its lifetime, seeks security and creates the psychological illusion of 'self'. This illusion of 'self' then seeks fulfillment through identification with experience or even at the level of ideology.

Krishnamurti converges in agreement with the Gestalt which

has a wholistic approach to understanding of behaviour. The Gestalt field is viewed as a non static, dynamic process in which the activity of the individual is homeostatically acted out through behaviour patterns which satisfy a particular need. Hence the psychological and behavioural processes are considered in totality as an integrated function.

The emphasis that Krishnamurti places on the present, the 'now' is also fundamental to Gestalt theory and is a dynamic state of constant flux. In Gestalt theory, if the subject clings to the past i.e. memories and beliefs, then obstacles are created in the path of fluid Gestalten.

In interpreting Krishnamurti's educational ideas, it is quite evident that he heralds a spontaneous movement of learning, free from past conditioning and the field of the known; and free from the dichotomy between the knower and the known. When thought no longer interferes with the process of perception, and where perception functions spontaneously, a new dimension of learning emerges.

Krishnamurti emphasizes another approach to the understanding of man and his universe, and that is, by knowing the external reality as a whole and not by analytical observation. The mind seems to be an

ineffective instrument in the rapidly changing conditions of life, so far as the understanding of reality is concerned. It is too slow to interpret life's experiences, whose impacts come upon human consciousness in quick succession. An intuitive approach to the understanding of reality is therefore imperative. Hence reality has to be understood not through the interpreting medium of the mind, but by means of a faculty which transcends the limitations of the mental processes. The instrument which enables us to cognize this reality is not the intellect but intuition.

Krishnamurti determines consciousness at two levels viz. the consciousness of the conditioned mind and the consciousness that is free from craving and desire, and which is not a product of the mind. Hence in order to bring about a fundamental change in the structure of consciousness, one has to begin with the individual i.e. with oneself.

Krishnamurti looks at life as a whole and he says that it is only when man knows himself that he can be free from the limitations that are imposed upon himself. Hence he must start with self knowledge as the only state of being that can transcend the level of consciousness, that brings in contradiction. Self knowledge leads us to truth and to 'what is'. It makes choiceless awareness possible which

can transform the structure of human consciousness by putting an end to the perpetuation of duality. Awareness is awakened intelligence, intuitive discernment; and to be aware with one's entire being is according to Krishnamurti the central theme of his purpose of education. It is through self-knowledge that there is the realisation that the self is part of consciousness. What Krishnamurti calls creative thinking is in actuality right thinking. This is the process of being aware without evaluation, or acceptance, or condemnation or justification. It is constant awareness and rises spontaneously with self knowledge - which is the perception of the ways of the self.

Krishnamurti points out that thinking in terms of ideals is what creates conflict, and it is only through an instant perception of what is that right action can come about. Thus when there is an insight, there is total freedom and learning takes place instantly. Krishnamurti is not referring to the usual academic intelligence, but to an unique, innate, human quality requiring new dimensions and conceptual frameworks based on spontaneous insight in the contemporary educative process.

Krishnamurti conceives self-knowledge as the beginning of wisdom for it implies the spontaneous discernment of the

true and false in the centre of ones being.

The individual is a microcosm of society and because of the reciprocal relation between an individual and society, the individual contributes to society and society in turn shapes the individual.

Krishnamurti asserts that society has in itself the seeds of its own corruption and that in order to change society we must break away from it. The bad in society stems from a lack of true freedom. It stems from our acceptance of conventional ideas and values, from the fear of society judging the value framework and from the institutions that enforce false values and reinforce inequalities. These conditions are external and can be altered not to interfere with the inner nature of man. Hence to Krishnamurti the creation of a new society can come about only when the individual undergoes a radical transformation of the psyche. To Krishnamurti, a good society must be one in which everyone is free - and internal freedom is what he is concerned with. That is, to him happiness is to be found only when the individual is true to himself and learns to be happy within his limits rather than subject himself to the unsatisfying grab of desires.

In an educational situation, individuals are unduly subjected to conflict within themselves as they have to fit into a system that curbs their freedom to think.

As is obvious, this far, the effort in this study centered mainly on an intelligent discernment of Krishnamurti's teachings, in general, and, not as an attempt to predicate a theory of Krishnamurti. A simultaneous effort was made to review some of the classical and contemporary philosophies in an attempt to draw the perspective upon which Krishnamurti's educational ideas must have crystallized.

As most Scholars of Krishnamurti will agree, one cannot arrive at conclusions about his philosophy and extraordinary perspicuity. Krishnamurti repudiated all attempts at framing any such theories pointing that to be grounded in conclusions is to be conditioned by ideas and this conditioning interferes with the wholeness of life. He discouraged the formation of doctrines, or, dogmas, or cults which according to Krishnamurti were the result of thought processes. 'Thought' according to Krishnamurti obstructs the direct perception of 'Truth'.

In the final analysis, the farthest that one can go, is, at the most, to reflect and, probably, merely relate to the

most stupendous mind that dawned on this century.

Krishnamurti's philosophical ideas, unlike those of other contemporary Indian philosophers is not located within the Indian tradition and no attempt is made to defend or reflect or critically evaluate the Vedantic tradition. Krishnamurti's philosophical articulations are also free from Western ideological moorings giving it a transcultural dimension with an universal appeal.

Krishnamurti maintains that in the present educational climate, the individual human self ceases to exist as he is smothered in systems. What Krishnamurti is implying is that the schools must be open to experimentation with innovative ideas in education, more democratic attitudes and free of rigid agendas. Like the existentialists, Krishnamurti too transcended philosophizing that had no context with ordinary human existence and projected into the subtle and penetrating field of psychology and the mental states of the human mind. He attempted to create a philosophy for modern man to live by, defending the humanity of mankind against the oppressiveness of modern society and its subservience to science, philosophy and organized religion.

According to Krishnamurti, in order to understand ourselves, we must begin by understanding our relationship with the external world. This relationship is 'life'. Krishnamurti points out that an awareness of life as a whole is the first step toward our understanding of ourselves. Awareness comes when we can regard something without any interpretation, without comparison and without judgement. As a matter of fact Krishnamurti does not postulate any theory, he only points out the facts of existence. As far as reality is concerned, he does not predicate any theory, for reality cannot be described, it can only be discerned intuitively. Krishnamurti's own dissertation of 'life' may not be historically innovative in its bearing but his approach which is both practical and dynamic derives its validity from his direct communion with reality, and not from any authority or intellectualized philosophy. Krishnamurti draws from the humanism in all these philosophies in an effort to humanize education in accord with humanistic values, philosophy and theory. Thus he is concerned with developing the individual's way of understanding experience without necessarily mastering the details of knowledge. This approach seeks to emphasize the individual's choice, self worth, interpersonal skills, and, consequently pacing education according to the individual's own emergent needs. On the other hand if the students are made to think of their individuality as completely linked

up with the interests of society and never to consider their own existence as significant in itself, then by the time they acquire the essential maturity to take decisions they will instead come to identify themselves only as members of their social milieu.

Krishnamurti recommends a dynamic learning environment together with a well structured curriculum at the centre of which are the students themselves. Hence although there are limitations to the methods needed to bring about such an agenda of change, a favourable climate can be created in the learning situation which will create an awareness in the students and enable them to see life in totality. Obviously each individual must do this for themselves and see the whole structure of their mind and how it is conditioned in their own experience.

According to Krishnamurti any question asking how to create this kind of movement; how to awaken intelligence, is a wrong way of coping with the situation because it then seeks a product, a solution based on the known. The consequence of such an approach results in a method, a formula and this is contrary to the optimum learning climate which requires compete psychological freedom in the dissolution of the past. In essence what Krishnamurti means by education is the awakening of intelligence. This

demands a radically new appreciation of curriculum, and placing the learner at the centre of the curriculum. Conventional curriculum is designed with little concern for the individual and infact the child's educational success is evaluated in terms of how well he compares with the projected ideal. This creates a confusion in the child as he 'is' and the curriculum which imposes an 'ideal'. The result is that this curriculum projects ideals and knowledge extending from social values. This produces a blue print for conditioning the child and inhibiting integration.

Krishnamurti does not deny the need of worthwhile knowledge for a 'daily living, and he advocates a more wholistic perspective. The main factor in shifting the curriculum from a mere instrument of conditioning to a dynamic field of learning, is , intelligence. The preplanned curriculum restricts the unlimited possibilities of learning and curbs the sense of discovery and creativity. The present curriculums merely reinforce the I-complex of the learner. Hence, only when the I-complex is removed can new ways of constructing the curriculum be created which emphasises the creativity of the learner. The curriculum will shift from being an instrument of conditioning to one of 'conviviality'.

In some curriculum structures the learners are given the freedom to ask self initiated questions. In Krishnamurti's opinion it is not the quality and quantity of questions that matter so much as the quality of the mind which asks it. According to Krishnamurti any form of question is to be rejected as it betrays a mind which is conditioned by the past, seeking solutions. What is of value is the quality of the intelligence required to approach the problem wholistically and with insight. Thus in reality there is a curriculum for the individual learner which is more wholistic and individualized and is founded on the integrated intelligence. This is termed as the curriculum Gestalt. Gestalt implies a field of perception in which the perceiver sees himself as a part of the field, and, seeing the whole, the parts then acquire a new meaning. The individual loses the sense of separateness from the environment.

A Gestalt curriculum is unified structurally connecting the interrelationship of the different disciplines and fields of knowledge. Gestalt implies a wholistic view and a learning Gestalt can come about only when the 'self' is dissolved and intelligence is integrated. It is based on the present, the 'now', and on the integrated awareness of the learner who can learn for himself with the teacher as the facilitator.

The important function of the teacher is to create a learning environment which will bring about a 'revolution of the psyche'. The existing atmosphere of learning with competitive grading, teacher centred learning, routine schedule, use of rewards and punishments, is not conducive to a Gestalt curriculum. According to Krishnamurti, the learner must understand what he is learning and not passively ingest a quantity of knowledge and information. The Learner needs a very personalized relationship with the teacher as an important precondition of the curriculum gestalt. He therefore suggests a very limited class size with a teacher ratio of 1:7. The size of the class is of utmost importance, as beyond an optimum size the quality of relationships between teacher and student diminishes and hence learning decreases because quantity and quality are interrelated. According to Krishnamurti, teaching is not different from learning. They are both the same movement. The teacher must share in the whole process of self discovery, and this requires a great deal of honesty, humility and courage. The teacher thus develops better communication and inspires his students with the spirit of learning. The management of space in the learning environment is of tremendous relevance in the teacher-pupil relationship. If the students are arranged in regimented rows with the teacher staged authoritatively at the front, it immediately creates an impact on the mind of the

students, and, their relationship with the teacher is immediately categorized into one of subservience rather than equality thereby sustaining the myth of the teacher's authority. In a convivial atmosphere where teacher and pupil can interact freely, it must be pointed out that although Krishnamurti believes that the atmosphere of learning must be a relaxed one, he is not for permissively letting students do whatever they wish but rather concentrate first on the child's negativities without condemnation or judgement and particularly without comparison to the ideal. This will enable the teacher to bring about the 'flowering of the child' in terms of the child's own capacity. It would seem a cumbersome task to guide the child along the endless path of self knowledge and help him to 'flower' as a total human being. But Krishnamurti believes that this is the real challenge of education - to help the students understand themselves thoroughly, the mechanisms of their feelings and how they have been conditioned by their home, school and society and finally to understand the whole movement of life. The main focus of gestalt curriculum is to help the student dissolve the 'self'. Krishnamurti points out that the child must know how to observe his thoughts and feelings without the impulse to act them out in his environment. Krishnamurti likes the process to the blossoming of a flower which must <sup>ripen</sup> come to fruition and is then given the freedom to die.

Feelings, according to Krishnamurti, must not be suppressed and must be allowed to complete their full cycle i.e. if a child is angry he must be allowed to experience the feeling dispassionately, and not in a self indulgent way - the whole gestalt of the feeling has to be allowed. It is only when the feeling is allowed to 'flower' in his way, that it will lose its hold on the mind. This is for the painful as well as the pleasurable feelings. The art of allowing thoughts and feelings to 'flower' is the process of self knowledge. This process is an effortless activity and is synonymous with the revolution of the psyche which Krishnamurti insists on. It is not to be mistaken with permissiveness i.e. allowing the child to do as he so wishes so that he impulsively acts it out in his environment causing a disturbance.

Thus according to Krishnamurti, if an individual is angry and wishes to be without anger, he can only allow the flowering of non-anger by first accepting his anger and not suppressing it in favour of the ideal, non-anger. It is only when the anger is squarely met with that it will be understood and then it will be dissolved. The consequent absence of anger is the state of non-anger. In this context, non-anger is not yet a fact nor even an assumption, until anger itself dissolves.

The mind must be free from fear and inhibition if learning has to take place.

Conventional schools encourage fear through their dependence on techniques of motivation and coercion thereby making the child conform with certain norms. Hence these schools actively encourage fear. According to Krishnamurti fear is produced by non-acceptance of 'what is'. Fear projects the image over the fact bringing about division, conflict and desire. It is according to Krishnamurti, the most destructive and crippling factor for learning. The element of trust between the teacher and the pupil will lead him effortlessly to investigate the fears that obsess him, and help him understand and dissolve the fear.

Krishnamurti has shown how thought and knowledge are inimical to the integration of intelligence. And intelligence comes effortlessly when the whole nature and structure of relationship is seen. Conversely this means that right relationship requires a great deal of intelligence. The essential quality which Krishnamurti calls the 'atmosphere' is the attentiveness and the alertness of intelligence shared by the teacher and students as they investigate a subject together. This requires a sensitive relationship free of any form of compulsion or fear. Only when the student is

•

psychologically free will he begin learning, and this freedom is found in right relationship.

If the students are to relate sensitively and cooperatively with their colleagues and their teachers then the same feeling must prevade among the teaching faculty. If there is disharmony, then the whole climate of learning will be affected. It is therefore important for the teachers to be free of fears concerning professional initiative, and free from hierarchical pressures. They must have the leisure, both psychological and administrative, for drawing up innovative programmes. Responsibility should be democratically shared by all, teachers and students alike and students should be a part of the school's important decision making process.

Krishnamurti rejects any kind of comparison as comparison is an inherent part of the mechanism of the I-centre. The essence of comparison is division and Krishnamurti says that when there is no comparison, there is integrity. Comparison is the striving to become what the self 'is not'. It is the psychological division between 'what is', the fact, and the image created by thought. All techniques of measurement and grading are based on comparison and help to perpetuate the division in the psyche. Hence when these systems of measurement are used in evaluation there is

•

division between the high achievers and the low ones, resulting in damage to the confidence of low achievers and grandiose attitudes to the high achievers. The systems of measurements are in an indirect way, subtle forms of reward and punishment.

Krishnamurti points out that relationship is a crucial factor in life and should be used as a central theme for an entire curriculum. Relationship is relevant to practically everything that is to be taught in school because life is in essence, relationship, and at the heart of relationship is intelligence. The whole of man's evolution can be seen in terms of a changing relationship with the environment, whether biological, cultural, social or psychological for example even a discipline like physics is about relationship - viz Einstein's theory of relativity is based upon the relationship of mass and energy and so on. Relationship is therefore a universal theme, and coupled with the determining factor of intelligence it should be emphasized in the school curriculum.

Self knowledge is the turnkey of the gestalt curriculum.

Krishnamurti considers self knowledge as the only state in which the individual and the society, created by him, can look at, and see 'what is'; and can therefore transcend the level of consciousness that breeds contradictions and

problems. Self knowledge is therefore a way of liberating life from the self imposed limitations of conditioned existence and also of bringing about a fundamental revolution of the psyche and creating a new social order which is based on the action of intelligence. Thus self knowledge is the way of total action which grasps the individual and society in one single movement of life.

In conclusion, one could summarize the relevant conclusions drawn from the insights of Krishnamurti's philosophy in the following: Krishnamurti's ideas, often repetitive, have both theoretical and practical relevance for the contemporary educational curriculum. Firstly, the intuitive approach to the understanding of reality overcomes the limitations of the mental processes and interpretation of reality through the medium of the mind. The intellectual, academic exercise of the present day curriculum has to make way for spontaneous insight, which is an unique, innate human quality requiring new dimensions and conceptual frameworks.

Secondly, Krishnamurti's recognition that present day educational climate has led to ceasing of existence of human self as it is smothered in systems, calls for a new understanding of life. And this will be achieved by our awareness of life as a whole, which is a prelude to our

•

understanding of ourselves and our relationship with the external world.

Thirdly, such an understanding of life and ourselves; and our relationship with the world leads to humanizing education and pacing education according to the individual's own emergent needs.

Fourthly, at a very practical level, Krishnamurti called for a dynamical learning environment with students as the centre of of a well structured curriculum. In such an environment when there is complete psychological freedom (from the past), learning is at its optimum. Simultaneously only when the 'I-complex' is removed can new ways of constructing the curriculum be created, which emphasises the creativity of the learner and changes the curriculum into one of 'conviviality' instead of an instrument of conditioning and rigidity. Consequently, it results in 'curriculum Gestalt'.

Krishnamurti's concern for an ideal learning environment stresses the need for a personalized relationship between learner and teacher. In fact, teaching is not different from learning, and the teacher must share in the whole process of learning and discovery.

The convivial learning atmosphere develops better communication and inspires students with the spirit of learning.

And finally, the real challenge of education is to help students understand themselves thoroughly; help them to understand the mechanisms of their feelings and how they have been conditioned by their home, school and society. In short, it is to understand the whole movement of life.

It is often true that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, more perilous to conduct or more uncertain of success than to initiate a new order of things. A new order is what is called for. Krishnamurti's educational ideas provides schools across the world with both, a challenge and an opportunity!.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### GENERAL

- Adler, Mortimer, and Milton Mayer, The Revolution in Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Aggarwal, J.C., Development and Planning of Modern Education Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi, 1982.
- , Theory and Principles of Education, Vikas, New Delhi, 1994.
- Aristotle, Politics, New York: Modern Library, 1943.
- Apple, W.W., Ideology and Curriculum, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.
- Augustine, St., A. City of God, Image Books, New York, 1958.
- Austin, J.L., Philosophical Papers, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Balfour Clarke R., The Mind of Swami Vivekananda, Jaico Pub. House, Bombay, 1975.
- Barret, T.H., Zen, the Reason of Unreason, Aquarias Thorsons, Harper Collins Publishers, London, 1993.
- Bayles, Ernest, Pragmatism and education, New York, Harper and Row, 1966.
- Bergson Henri, Creative Evolution, Translated by Arthur Mitchell, N.Y. Modern Library, 1944.
- Bourne L., and Estrand B. Psychology Its Principles and Meanings, N.Y., 1976.
- Brameld Theodore, Towards a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education, N.Y.,: Dryden, 1956.
- Bronwksi, J., The Ascent of Man, Futura Publications, London, 1987.
- Brubacher, John S., Modern Philosophies of Education, McGraw Hill Book Ciompany, Inc. 1939, 1950, 1962.
- Buber Martin, I and Thou, Translated by R.G. Smith, New York, Charles Scribners, 1958.
- Butler Donald, Four Philosophies, New York: Harper, 1951.
- , Idealism in Education, New York: Harper and Row, 1966

- Chattopadhyaya, D.P., in What is Living and What is Dead in Indian Philosophy, N. Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1976.
- , Indian Philsophy: A Popular Introduction N.Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1972.
- Chaube, S.P., Recent Educational Philosophies in India, Ram Prasad & Sons Publishers, 1967.
- Chopra D., Ageless Body, Timeless Mind The Quantum Alternative to Growing Old, Harmony Books, New York, 1993.
- Dewey, John, experience and education, New York: Macmillan, 1938.
- , How We Think, Boston: D.C. Heath, 1983.
- Erikson E.H., Identity, Youth and Crisis, W.W. Norton & Co., New York, 1968.
- Fann, K.T. (ed.), Symposium on J.L. Austin, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Froebel, Friedrich, The Education of Man, Translated by W.N. Hailman, New York: A. M. Kelley, 1974.
- Henry B. Nelson, Modern Philosophies & Education, Central Book Depot, Allhabad, 1970.
- Gupta, Surendranath Das, Philosophical essays, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1982.
- Guyer Paul, (ed) The Cambridge Campanion to Kant, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Hans Nicholas, Comparative Education, Routledge & Kegan Paul, New Delhi, 1992.
- Hawking, Stephen W., A Brief History of Time, Bantam Books, Great Britain, 1992.
- Hirst, P.H., Liberal Education in L.C. Deighton (ed.), The Enclopedia of Education, Vol. 5, New York, Macmillan and Free Press, 1971.
- Hume, David, Treatise upon Human Nature, London: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Huxley Aldous, Brave New World, New York: Bantam, 1932.

- Kant, Immanuel, Education, Translated by Churton A., University of Michigan Press, 1960.
- , Critique of Practical Reason, Translated by Lewis White Beck. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1956.
- Kierkegaard, S.A., Fear and Trembling and the Sickness unto Death, Translated by Walter Lawrie, Princeton, N. Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1954.
- Kohler W., The Mentality of Apes, New York Harcourt Brace, 1925.
- Krishnan Daya, Three Myths About Indian Philosophy, Quest, 53, 1967.
- Lal, B.K., Contemporary Indian Philosophy, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1989.
- Locke, John, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, N.Y. E.P. Dutton, 1961.
- , On Education Edited by Peter Gay, New York, Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1964.
- Mahadevan, T.M.P. and Saroja, G.V., Contemporary Indian Philosophy, N.D.: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1981.
- Marx Karl, Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Science, Translated and edited by Lloyd D. Easton and Kurt Guddat, Garden City, New York, Anchor Books Edition, 1967.
- McDermott, (ed.) The Essential Aurobindo, N.Y.: Schocken Books, 1974.
- Mohan B., Conceptualization of Existential Intervention, Psychol: Q.J. Human Behaviour, 1979.
- Murthy, Satchitananda, K., Philosophy in India: Tradition, Teaching and Research, New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1985.
- Montessori, Maria, The Secret of childhood, translated by Barbala Barclay Carter, New York: Longmans, Green, 1936.
- Musgrave, P.W., and Shelleck, R.J.W., Alternative Schools, Hong Kong, J. Wiley & Sons, 1975.
- Naravana, V.S., Modern Indian Thought, New Delhi, Orient Longman, 1978.
- Neill A.S., Summerhill, New York: Hart, 1960. •

- Orwell, George, 1984, New York, Harcourt Brace, 1949.
- Ozmon H., Craver S., Philosophical Foundation of Education, A. Bell & Howell, Ohio, 1981.
- Pavlov, I.P., Conditioned Reflex, New York: Dover Press, 1960.
- Perls, F.S., Gestalt Therapy, Verbatim, Lafayette, Calif.: Real People Press, 1969.
- , Four Lectures, Gestalt Therapy Now, Eds. J. Fagon and I.L. Shepherd, N.Y., Harper, 1970.
- Philips E.M., and Pugh D.S., How to get a Ph.D. UPSD, Delhi, 1987.
- Pierce Charles, Philosophy and Human Nature, New York: New York University Press, 1971.
- Plato, The Republic, Translated by B. Jowett, N.Y. Modern Library, 1941.
- Puligandla, R., Fundamentals of Indian Philosophy, Nashville: Abigdon Press, 1975.
- Prasad, Rajendra, Philosophy and the Phenomenological Research, XXI, 3, 1971.
- Radhakrishnan, S., Indian Philosophy, Vol. I, London: George Alen & Unwin, 1932.
- Rogers C.R., On Becoming a Person: A Therapists View of Psychotherapy, Boston: Hongton Mifflin, 1961.
- Rousseau, J.J., Emile, London, Everyman's Library, 1911.
- Rusk, Robert, R., Doctrines of the Great Educators, (4th ed) Macmillan Student Editors, St. Martins Press, New York, 1969.
- Rugg, Harold O., The Great Technology, New York: John Day, 1933.
- Russell, B., Principles of Social Reconstruction, London, Allen & Unwin, 1916.
- , Education and Good Life, New York: Boni and Liverright, 1926.

- , Education and the Modern World, New York: W.W. Norton, 1932.
- , Bertrand Russell Speaks his Mind, Arthur, Barker Ltd., London, 1960.
- , On Education, Especially in early childhood, Unwin Paperbacks, London, 1985.
- Sachdeva, I.P., Yoga and Depth Psychology, N.Delhi, Motilal Banarsidas, 1978.
- Safaya, R.N., Great Indian Educators, The Associated Publishers, 1981.
- Saiyidain, K.G., The Humanist Tradition in Indian Educational Thought, Asia Pub. House, 1966.
- Satre, Jean Paul, Existentialism and Human Emotions, Translated by Hazel Barnes, New York, Philosophical Library, 1947.
- Sen Gautam, The Mind of Swami Vivekananda, Jaico Pub. House, Bombay, 1975.
- Sharma, R.N., Contemporary Indian Philosophy, New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 1991.
- Singh L.C., Multiple Models of Teaching for Educators Vikas Publishing House P. Ltd., New Delhi, 1995.
- Skinner, B.F., Walden Two, New York, Macmillan, 1948.
- , Beyond Freedom and Dignity, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.
- Sodhi T.S.; G.S. Sandhu and S. Balwanth Singh, Philosophies of Education, The Indian Publications, 1988.
- Srivastava, R.S., Contemporary Indian Philosophy, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Pvt. Ltd., 1983.
- Strain, John Paul, Idealism: A Clarification of an Educational Philosophy, Educational Theory 25, 1975.
- Suzuki, D., Zen, Mind, Beginner's Mind, New York, Weatherhill, 1976.
- Thomas R. M., "The Encyclopadia of Human Development and Education, Theory and Research and Studies", Basic Concepts of Behaviourism, Pergamon Press, England.

- Toffler Alvin, Future Shock, Bantam Books, New York, 1981.
- Watson George., Writing a Thesis, Longman, England, 1987.
- , Behaviourism, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Vas, Luis S.R., The Mind of Krishnamurti, Jaico Publishing House, Bombay, 1971.
- Wallen, R., Gestalt Therapy and Gestalt Psychology, Gestalt Therapy Now, Eds. J. Fagon and I.L. Shephard, N.Y., Harper, 1970.
- Zeldin, David, The Educational Ideas of Charles Fourier, New York: A.M. Kelley, 1969.

BY KRISHNAMURTI

- Krishnamurti J., The First and Last Freedom, 1954.
- , This Matter of Culture, (ed.) D. Rajagopal, Copyright 1964 by Krishnamurti Writings Inc., 1974.
- , Conversations, KFI, 1970.
- , Mind in Meditation, KFI, 1971.
- , The Flight of the Eagle, KFI, 1971.
- , The Impossible Question, Arkana, 1972.
- , On Education, KFI, 1974.
- , Beginnings of Learning, Penguin Books, 1975.
- , Inward Flowering, 1977.
- , A Dialogue with Oneself, 1977
- , Exploration into Insight, KFI, Madras, 1979.
- , Freedom, Responsibility & Discipline, 1980.
- , Letters to the Schools, KFI, 1981.
- , The Flame of Attention, KFI, 1983.
- , Beginnings of Learning, Penguin Books, 1986.

- , Mind Without Measure, KFI, 1984-87.
- , Beyond Violence, P.I. Publication, New Delhi, 1986.
- , The Question of Freedom, Central Chinmaya Mission Trust, 1990.
- , Commentaries on Living, I Series, KFI, 1991.
- , Commentaries on Living, II, KFI, 1991.
- , Life Ahead, KFI, 1992.
- , Commentaries on Living, III, KFI, 1992.
- , Unconditionally Free, KFI, America, 1995.
- , Early Writings, KFI, I, 1969-70.
- , Early Writings, KFI, II, 1969-70

Talks including Discussion

- Krishnamurti, J., Authentic Reports of 8 talks given at Ojai in 1936, Ommen, 1936.
- , Authentic notes of discussion and talks given at Ojai and Sarobia in 1940, Ommen, 1940.
  - , Authentic Reports of 10 Talks given at Ojai in 1944, Madras, 1946.
  - , Authentic Reports of 16 alks given at Oakgrove, Ojai in 1945-1946, Madras, 1947.
  - , Talks in New York and Seattle in 1950, Verbatim Report, Madras, 1950.
  - , Talks in Madras in 1952, Verbatim Reports, Madras, 1952.
  - , Talks at London in 1953, Verbatim Report, London, 1953.
  - , Talks and Dialogues, Saanen, 1968.
  - , Talks 1979, KFI Bulletin, Vol. 2, 1980.

ON KRISHNAMURTI

- Dhopeswarkar A.D., Krishnamurti and the Texture of Reality, Chetana, Bombay, 1961.
- , Krishnamurti and the Experience of the Silent Mind, Chetana, Bombay, 1981.
- Fonere, Rene, Krishnamurti the man and his Teaching, Chetana, Bombay, 1981.
- Heber, Lilly, Krishnamurti and the World Crisis, London, 1935.
- Hook, A., The Awakening of Intelligence, J. Krishnamurti's Approach to Education, Dissertation for the degree of B.Ed (Hons) of Murdoch University, 1984. (published Dissertation).
- Jayakar, P., J. Krishnamurti a Biography, Penguin Books, 1986.
- Kare, B.B., J. Krishnamurti, Things of the Mind, Motilal Bararsidass, 1988.
- Lutyens Mary, J. Krishnamurti - Freedom from the Known, B.I.Publications, P. Ltd., New Delhi, 1987.
- , Krishnamurti The Open Door, John Murray, 1988.
- Mehta R., Krishnamurti and the Nameless Experience, New York, Samuel Weiser, N., 1979.
- , Krishnamurti's Approach to Life: The Intuitive Philosophy, Chetana (P) Ltd., 1988.
- Methorst Kniper A.J.G., Krishnamurti, Chetana, 1976.
- Niel Andre, S. Dikshit (ed.), Krishnamurti - the Man in Revolt, Bombay, Chetana, 1973.
- Phadte V.M., J.K. Philosophy of Religion, (A thesis for the degree of Ph.D. submitted to the University of Bombay), 1981. (Unpublished Dissertation).
- Shringy R.K., Philosophy of J. Krishnamurti, A Systematic Study, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers (P) Ltd., 1977.

Suares, Carlos, (Edn. 5), Krishnamurti and the Unity of Man,  
Bombay, Chetana, 1953.

Thakar Vimala, Eternal Voyage, Vimal Parivar, Bombay, 1994.

Thapan, Meenakshi, Life at School, An Ethnographic Study,  
Oxford University Press, 1991.

Weeraperuma, S., Living and Dying from Moment to Moment,  
Chetana, Bombay, 1978.

----, Bliss of Reality, Chetana, Bombay, 1984.

----, That Pathless Land, Chetana, Bombay, 1987.

----, ABibliography on the Life and Teachings of J.  
Krishnamurti, E.J. Brill, Leiden, Neitherlands,  
1974.

#### LIST OF VIDEO TAPES FROM KFI LIBRARY - MADRAS

1.	1982	Calcutta	Talks 1 & 2
2.	1983	Saanen	Talks 1 & 2
3.	1983	Saanen	Talks 3 & 4
4.	1983	Saanen	Talks 5 & 6
5.	1983	Brockwood	Talks 2 & Q & A. 1
6.	1983	Brockwood	Talks 3 & 4
7.	1984	Brockwood	Talks 1 & 2
8.	1984	Brockwood	Talks 3 & 4
9.	1984	Brockwood	Q & A 1 & 2
10.	1984	Rishi Valley	Discussion with students 1 & 2
11.	1984	Madras	Q & A 1 & 2
12.	1985	Bombay	Talk 1 & 2
13.	1985	Bombay	Talk 3 & 4
14.	1985	Ojai	Talk 1 & 2
15.	1985	Washington	Talk 1 & 2
16.	1985	Brockwood	Talk 3 & 4
17.	1985	Brockwood	Q & A 1 & 2
18.	1985	Benares	Talk 1 & 2
19.	1985	Benares	Talk 3 Discussion with Campers

Discussions (Video Cassettes from KFI Library).

1. "The Future of Humanity" - Two Discussions with Dr. David Bohm  
"Transformation of Man" - Discussions with Dr. David Bohm & David Shainberg.
2. Discussions 1 & 2
3. "Where do I begin?" - Three Dialogues  
Dialogues with Dr. Jonas Salk, Prof. Huston Smith & Mrs. Pupul Jayakar.
4. "Be your own Teacher"- Four Programmes
  - i. Interview for Australian Broadcastion Corporation.
  - ii. Interview for British Broadcasting Corporation.
  - iii. "Problem of Living" - Film by Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
  - iv "Can you live that way?" - Discussions with students of Brockwood park.
5. "What was your Childhood like?" - Three discussions with Students of Brockwood Park - 1985.
6. An Introduction - I  
Brockwood Park - 1983 Talks 1 & 2.
7. An Introduction - II  
Brockwood Park - 1983 Talks 3 & 4.
8. Rajghat Talk - 3 - 1985  
Madras Talk - 4 - 1985
9. Benaras Talk - 1 - 1985  
Benaras Talk - 2 - 1985
10. RV Students Discussion - 1 - 1985  
RV Students Discussion - 2 - 1985
11. Saanen Q & A - 3 - 1985  
Saanen Talk - 5 - 1985 April 1994
12. Brockwood Q & A - 2 - 1983



Krishnamurti Foundation India - Publications

Bulletin	Vol. 1 & 2	1970
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1970
Bulletin	Vol. 4	1970
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1971
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1971
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1971
Bulletin	Vol. 4	1971
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1972
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1972
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1972
Bulletin	Vol. 4	1972
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1973
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1973
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1973
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1973
Bulletin	Vol. 4	1973
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1974
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1974
Bulletin	Vol. 4	1974
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1975
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1975
Bulletin	Vol. 4	1975
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1976
Bulletin	Vol. 4	1976
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1977
Bulletin	Vol. 4	1977
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1978
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1978
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1978
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1979
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1979
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1979
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1980
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1980
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1981
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1981
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1981
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1982
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1982
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1982
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1983
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1983
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1983
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1984
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1984
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1984
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1985
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1985

Bulletin	Vol. 3	1985
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1986
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1986
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1986
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1987
Bulletin	Vol. 2 & 3	1987
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1988
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1988
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1988
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1989
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1989
Bulletin	Vol. 3	1989
Bulletin	Vol. 1	1990
Bulletin	Vol. 2	1990

-\*