

Freedom from Suffering: A Comparative Study of Gautama Buddha and Jiddu Krishnamurti

Nikumoni Phukon

Research Scholar, Dept. of Philosophy, North-Eastern Hill University

Abstract:

The present paper is a comparative and critical study of Gautama Buddha and Jiddu Krishnamurti on the problem of suffering and the possibility of freedom. Both thinkers explore the psychological causes of human suffering and challenge the notion that sustainable freedom can be achieved through external authority, belief or dependence. Their teachings are very similar in their treatment of desire, attachment, impermanence, self, awareness and direct understanding of truth. However, the paper suggests that these similarities should not obscure significant philosophical differences. In Buddhist thought, suffering is explained through craving, ignorance and the conditions that sustain existence. But Krishnamurti focuses mainly on psychological conditioning, thought, fear, attachment and conflict in daily life. They also differ in their attitude toward renunciation, spiritual discipline, the status of the world, and the meaning of liberation. The paper critically reviews whether Krishnamurti's idea of psychological freedom is the same as the Buddhist idea of nirvana or is instead a different, modern idea of liberation. The study's comparative analysis suggests that both thinkers understand the transformation of consciousness as essential to freedom, but they articulate this transformation within different philosophical frameworks. The best way to understand their dialogue then is not in terms of simple identity but as a productive encounter between Buddhist liberation and Krishnamurti's radical account of freedom in everyday existence.

Keywords: Suffering, Attachment, Freedom, Nirvana, Conditioning.

Introduction:

Pain is one of the fundamental problems of human existence. Fear and anxiety and desire and attachment and loss and conflict and dissatisfaction and awareness of death characterise human life. Both Gautama Buddha and Jiddu Krishnamurti say that suffering may result from external circumstances, but it cannot be understood only by external conditions. Its deeper roots are in the way human beings perceive, think, desire and identify themselves. Gautama Buddha gave a systematic philosophical and practical explanation of suffering in the Four Noble Truths. He pointed out suffering, the cause of suffering, the end of suffering, and the way to the end of suffering. His explanation of the human predicament is based on craving, ignorance, and attachment. Nirvana, or liberation, is the extinguishing of the causes of suffering and bondage. Jiddu Krishnamurti, although writing and speaking in the modern context, also brought freedom from suffering to the centre of his philosophical inquiry. He discusses fear, attachment, psychological dependency, comparison, conflict, conditioning and the movement of thought. Krishnamurti considered freedom to be more than mere freedom from external constraints. It is freedom from the psychological chains, from the way in which the mind produces and sustains conflict.

Krishnamurti has frequently been compared with the Buddha. Many believe that J. Krishnamurti taught the same thing as the Buddha, but in a new speech and a new style. His teachings are similar to the original teachings of the Buddha and to some ideas developed by later Buddhist philosophers. Both thinkers doubt the permanence of the self, reject reliance on authority, and emphasise direct understanding. However, the similarities between them do not justify an uncritical identification of their philosophies. Thus, the paper tries to answer the following questions: What is the nature of suffering for Buddha and Krishnamurti? What is the role of desire, attachment, thought and self in suffering? What role does awareness play in the overcoming of suffering? Can we equate Krishnamurti's psychological freedom with Buddhist nirvana? And how do they differ in their views on renunciation, the world, spiritual practice, and liberation? The main thesis of this paper is that Buddha and Krishnamurti are deeply concerned with the transformation of human consciousness, but their respective approaches to liberation are in different philosophical frameworks. The best way to understand their relation is in terms of similarity and critical distinction.

1. Philosophical Problem of Suffering

1.1. Suffering in Buddhist Philosophy

The Buddha's teaching starts with the recognition of suffering, which is traditionally formulated as the First Noble Truth. Birth is suffering, ageing is suffering, sickness is suffering, death is suffering, association with the unpleasant is suffering, separation from the pleasant is suffering, not getting what one wants is suffering. But Buddhist suffering is not merely physical pain or extraordinary misfortune. It also contains the instability and dissatisfaction of conditioned existence. The Second Noble Truth is that craving is a major cause of suffering. Craving may be craving for sensual pleasure, craving for existence, craving for non-existence. It is fed by ignorance, the inability to see the truth: impermanence and that there is no permanent self. Human beings suffer because they try to cling to what is changing and build security on what cannot provide permanent security.

The Buddhist analysis is not just a moral condemnation of desire. It is a study of the relationship between desire, attachment, ignorance and pain. The problem is not so much that human beings desire, but that they become attached psychically and existentially to what they desire. The Third Noble Truth is the possibility of the end of suffering. If craving can cease and ignorance can cease, suffering can cease. The Fourth Noble Truth tells us that the Noble Eightfold Path is the way to that cessation. So, Buddhist liberation is not just an abstract idea but a process of transformation through understanding, ethical conduct, mental discipline and wisdom.

1.2. Suffering in Krishnamurti's Philosophy

Krishnamurti as well starts with the direct observation of human suffering. His discussions are often about fear, loneliness, attachment, jealousy, anxiety, comparison, ambition, conflict and psychological dependence. Instead of presenting suffering mainly within a systematic religious framework, he encourages people to look directly at suffering in their daily lives. For Krishnamurti, thought often compounds psychological suffering. Thought creates images of self and others, compares the present with the past, anticipates the future, and strives for psychological continuity. For example, suffering in relationships can come not only from actual events, but from the images and expectations that thought creates.

Another major source of suffering is attachment. Krishnamurti distinguishes between love and attachment and psychological dependence. Fear of loss is a natural byproduct of depending on another person for security, identity, or emotional fulfilment. Thus, attachment can be a breeding ground for jealousy,

possessiveness and conflict. Krishnamurti's central question is: Is it possible to understand suffering without escaping from it, or suppressing it, or merely explaining it? He contends that observation is the key. One has to see a fear as a fear, an attachment as an attachment and a conflict as a conflict, and not immediately try to change them according to an ideal. This method goes with his statement "The seeing is the doing". The statement suggests that full perception is not simply an intellectual activity of a preliminary type. But when one sees something clearly, without distortion, without resistance, perception itself may be transformative.

1.3. Comparison

Both Buddha and Krishnamurti eschew a superficial approach to suffering. Neither sees suffering as something to be permanently resolved by external pleasure, possession or dependence. Both dig into the internal reasons that feed suffering. The stress, however, is different. Suffering is part of the whole picture of the conditioned existence, dependent origination, karma, rebirth, and liberation in Buddhist philosophy. Krishnamurti is concerned with psychological suffering as it appears in the immediacy of thought, of relationship, of fear, of memory and in the daily experience of living.

This discrepancy raises a crucial question: is suffering an existential condition of conditioned existence per se, or is it mainly a psychological construct? For the Buddhist, suffering cannot be completely explained psychologically, because it relates to impermanence and the nature of conditioned existence. But from Krishnamurti's point of view, it is necessary to inquire into psychological suffering immediately, as an abstract explanation can become itself a form of escape. A critical comparison indicates that the two approaches are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Buddhism provides the wider philosophy of suffering. Krishnamurti offers a very intense study of the way suffering is actually experienced and reproduced in consciousness.

2. Desire, Attachment and the Construction of Self

2.1 Desires and craving

Craving is central to the origin of suffering in Buddhist philosophy. The problem arises when desire becomes attachment and maintains the illusion of permanence. The human seeks satisfaction in objects, experiences, relationships, identity, and existence itself. All conditioned things are subject to change. The Buddhist analysis does not entail that any ordinary intention or preference is the same as craving. Craving is more a form of grasping that leads to bondage. The trouble is the psychic demand that reality should match desire. Krishnamurti also looks at the movement of desire. Desire is not only a biological or practical necessity, but it becomes psychologically complex when thought produces images of pleasure, achievement, security and fulfilment. Desire often consists in measuring what is against what ought to be. The mind projects a future state and experiences the present as lacking. Desire is intimately connected with thought for Krishnamurti. Memory recollects pleasure, expects pleasure, and paints a picture of what it desires. Desire in this sense is not just an isolated impulse but part of a psychological process.

The comparison with Buddhism is obvious: both thinkers are sceptical that desire can bring lasting freedom. But they explain it in other terms. Buddhist thought places craving within the framework of dependent origination and the cessation of suffering. Krishnamurti's analysis of desire is in terms of the movement of thought and psychological time.

2.2 Psychological dependence and attachment

Another important point of comparison is attachment. In Buddhism, attachment or clinging is a condition that continues suffering. What is impermanent cannot provide permanent security, and so attachment to it

creates fear and dissatisfaction. Krishnamurti's analysis of attachment is particularly evident in his talks on human relationships. Attachment is not love, but a person may think attachment is love. Attachment has in it possession, fear, dependence and desire to control. Psychological security may be gained from a relationship, and thus the fear of losing that relationship may be enhanced.

This raises an important philosophical question: Can we love without attachment? Krishnamurti's response is that love is not the same as psychological dependence. Love based on possession or on fear is a form of bondage. A real relationship is free of fixed images and psychological domination. Buddhist philosophy also questions attachment, but its account is bound up with the wider cessation of clinging. The Buddhist position is not to simply argue for emotional indifference. Compassion, loving-kindness and ethical responsibility are central to Buddhist thought. Freedom from attachment should not be confused with freedom from care or concern.

Critical reading shows that both thinkers distinguish attachment from emotional coldness in their conception of freedom. But Krishnamurti's language of relationship and love is more immediately placed in everyday psychological life, while Buddhism offers a more elaborated ethical and contemplative framework.

2.3 The Problem of Self

One of the most powerful similarities between Krishnamurti and Buddha is the rejection of self as a permanent, independent and unchanging entity. Buddhist philosophy develops the doctrine of anatta, or non-self. The individual is not understood as having a permanent soul or fixed essence. The self is studied in relation to changing physical and mental processes. Ignorance and suffering are greatly based on the idea of a permanent self.

J. Krishnamurti, like the Buddha, refuses to accept the Vedic concept of a permanent, eternal and unchanging soul (atman). He studies the self as a movement of thought, memory, experience, identification and psychological continuity. The self is not a fixed substance but a process, a construction of consciousness. Often Krishnamurti asks if the self is anything but thought and memory. The self is the one who says "I", who remembers, compares, desires, fears and identifies with nationality, religion, profession, belief and relationship. This type of identification delineates "me" from "you," "us" from "them."

But a vital difference must be maintained. Buddhist anatta is a particular philosophical doctrine situated in a broader analysis of the aggregates, dependent origination, and liberation. The treatment of the self in Krishnamurti is largely phenomenological and psychological. He invites people to observe what the self does, rather than to offer a systematic metaphysical theory of non-self. So, both challenge the idea of a permanent self but in different conceptual contexts.

3. Truth, Consciousness and Direct Experience

3.1 Viewing Things as They Are

Buddha and Krishnamurti both stress the importance of seeing reality without distortion. Wisdom in Buddhist philosophy is the understanding of things as they are, especially their impermanence, unsatisfactoriness and non-self. Insight is something more than the acceptance of propositions; it is a change of understanding. Krishnamurti too feels that the realisation of truth is seeing things as they are. The truth is not simply an idea, a doctrine, a conclusion handed down by tradition. It must be directly understood.

What does it mean to see reality as it is? In Buddhism, seeing things as they are is seeing the nature of conditioned phenomena and the causes of suffering. It is connected with right view, mindfulness,

concentration, and wisdom. For Krishnamurti, seeing things as they are means observing without imposing preconceived ideas, ideals, labels, or conclusions. If a person observes anger through an inherited concept of anger, the observation may remain partial. Direct perception requires attention to the actual movement of anger. So, Krishnamurti's way is critical of the gap between experience and interpretation. Can thought, conditioned by the past, look without distortion, he asks?

3.2 Mindfulness and Awareness without Choice

The Buddhist notion of mindfulness is awareness of body, feeling, mind and phenomena. This is not simply passive observation but is part of a disciplined path of understanding and liberation. Mindfulness helps you to see the arising and passing away of experience, and it weakens unconscious clinging. This stress on direct observation is very similar to Krishnamurti's idea of choiceless awareness. Choiceless awareness is watching without choosing by preference, judgment or resistance. The observer does not merely choose the pleasant and reject the unpleasant. However, the two concepts should not be treated as identical. Buddhist mindfulness is embedded in a structured path of ethical conduct, concentration, and wisdom. Krishnamurti rejects the idea that freedom can be achieved through a fixed psychological method or system. His concern is to see what is before him, and not the slow acquisition of a prescribed skill.

This difference raises a crucial question: Can awareness itself bring about liberation, or does liberation require a disciplined path? From a Buddhist perspective, awareness is essential but is not isolated from ethical and contemplative development. The Noble Eightfold Path involves an integrated transformation of life and consciousness. Krishnamurti, by contrast, argues that the search for a method may create dependence and psychological time. If a person says, "I will become free after following this method for several years," freedom becomes a future goal, and the present remains conditioned. He therefore emphasises seeing the truth of conditioning directly.

A critical evaluation may suggest that Krishnamurti's position challenges the possibility of reducing transformation to mechanical practice, but it also raises a practical problem: How can a person cultivate sustained attention without some form of discipline, learning, or practice? Krishnamurti's answer is not a formal system, but the constant observation of daily living. But whether this suffices for all people is an open philosophical question.

3.3 The Paradox of Teaching Without Authority

But this position presents a big paradox. If truth is to be discovered alone, what is the function of a teacher? Buddha taught a great deal, built a community and offered a path. Krishnamurti travelled, gave talks, wrote books and influenced thousands of lives.

This leads to the question: Can a man teach freedom while denying authority to the teacher? The apparent contradiction can be resolved by distinguishing between authority as domination and teaching as communication or invitation to inquiry. A teacher may point out a difficulty. But he asks no obedience. A teaching may serve as a stimulus to observation, but it cannot replace direct understanding. But the paradox still matters. Even when Krishnamurti rejects authority, his words can become an authority for his followers. His rejection of systems may become a system in itself, and his rejection of gurus may lead some to treat him as a guru. This is not only a biographical problem; it is a philosophical problem of the relation of language and truth. A teaching that tells people not to rely on teachings can still create reliance. So, for Krishnamurti, philosophy involves not only a rejection of external authority but a constant vigilance against the emergence of a psychological authority around his words.

4. Liberation, Nirvana or Freedom in the World

Nirvana in Buddhist thought refers to the cessation of desire, ignorance and suffering. This is not just a temporary psychological state of peace. It is an indication of freedom from the conditions that create bondage. The meaning of nirvana has been interpreted variously in different Buddhist traditions. Some approaches focus on the extinguishing of craving and the cessation of suffering; others develop more elaborate metaphysical and philosophical interpretations. Thus, it is important not to confuse nirvana with mere emotional peace or mental relaxation.

Buddhist liberation is about ethical transformation, wisdom, meditation, and overcoming ignorance. In many traditional contexts, monastic life and renunciation are considered important conditions for the pursuit of liberation, but Buddhism has also developed significant lay traditions.

Krishnamurti's conception of freedom is mainly psychological and existential. Freedom is freedom from fear, attachment, conditioning, psychological authority, conflict and the domination of thought. It is not simply freedom to choose among alternatives. In fact, Krishnamurti often questions whether choice itself indicates confusion when the mind is divided. Krishnamurti did not think that freedom necessarily begins after withdrawal from the world. It is to be realised in relationship, in work, in family, in society and in daily life. His approach challenges the assumption that spiritual transformation requires a separation from ordinary existence. Krishnamurti does not propose renunciation of everyday life as a condition of freedom. Instead, he sees everyday life as the place where conditioning, attachment, fear and conflict can be observed.

Here, a question may arise: Is Krishnamurti's freedom concept the same as nirvana? This is, perhaps, the core philosophical issue of the comparison. Is Krishnamurti's psychological freedom the same thing as the Buddhist nirvana? There are reasons to see similarities. Both are about the cessation of attachment and ignorance, the transformation of consciousness and freedom from suffering. Both reject the idea that liberation can be achieved by belief alone or by external authority. But not all equivalences are created equal. Buddhist nirvana is one of a specific soteriology: dependent origination, the Four Noble Truths, the Noble Eightfold Path, and the cessation of craving. Krishnamurti does not offer a systematic doctrine of nirvana in parallel. His language is oriented to psychological freedom, direct perception, and the cessation of conflict in the present.

Moreover, Krishnamurti's non-acceptance of fixed methods and his call for freedom in daily life distinguish his approach from traditional Buddhist institutions and practices. His philosophy does not just translate Buddhist liberation into modern language but reconfigures some of the issues in a radical psychological perspective. The most defensible conclusion, then, is that Krishnamurti's freedom may be comparatively related to Buddhist liberation, but should not be treated as an exact equivalent of nirvana.

5. The World, The Everyday and Renunciation

One of the major differences between Buddha and Krishnamurti concerns the relation of liberation to the world. The Buddha founded a monastic community where renunciation, celibacy, discipline, meditation and ethical conduct were important. The monastic path developed into a major institutional expression of Buddhist liberation. Yet it would be wrong to suppose that Buddhism denies the reality of the world, or that all Buddhists hold that worldly life is meaningless. Buddhist traditions have evolved varied understandings of the world, of compassion, social responsibility, and lay practice. The claim that "Buddha and the Buddhists deny the reality of the world" needs to be taken cautiously. Buddhism is

typically sceptical of the permanent and independent substantiality of conditioned phenomena, but this is not necessarily equivalent to denying the empirical world altogether.

Krishnamurti is different. He says that freedom must be realised in the living of the world. Relationships, work, social life, daily experiences are not hindrances that should be necessarily given up. These are the very cases in which psychological conditioning is expressed.

This difference begs the question: How are we to be free in our participation in the everyday, or are we to be renunciants? Other Buddhists have made a distinction between the ultimate goal of liberation and the different conditions under which it is pursued. Renunciation is important in many Buddhist traditions, but Buddhist practice cannot be reduced to one institutional form. What Krishnamurti did was to challenge the idea that one must withdraw from life so as to find spiritual freedom. His position makes freedom immediately relevant for modern individuals living in families, professions, institutions and social relationships. But the vital question remains: does living in the world make freedom more accessible, or does it also increase the distractions and attachments that make liberation difficult? Krishnamurti answers that the world is not the essential problem; unconscious identification and psychological dependence are the problem. But whether this distinction is sufficient is debatable.

Conclusion

A comparative analysis of Gautama Buddha and Jiddu Krishnamurti shows a substantial philosophical connection concerning the problem of suffering and the potential for freedom. Both thinkers are sceptical of the notion that human beings can achieve lasting freedom through desire, attachment, belief or reliance upon external authority. Both stress the importance of direct seeing, of awareness, of impermanence and self-examination. Their similarities are particularly apparent in their treatment of psychological bondage. Buddha explains suffering in terms of craving, ignorance and attachment. Krishnamurti explores fear, thought, conditioning, psychological dependence and conflict. Both imply that freedom requires a change in the way reality is understood and experienced.

But the comparison also reveals important differences. In Buddhism, liberation is systematically articulated through the Four Noble Truths, dependent origination, the Noble Eightfold Path, and nirvana. Krishnamurti rejects any fixed systems or methods and stresses choiceless awareness and freedom in everyday life. His method is mainly psychological, but it raises larger issues of consciousness, self, truth, and being. The distinction between Buddhist nirvana and Krishnamurti's freedom should not be overlooked. Krishnamurti's comment that one must live in the world is a reflection of his singular position that liberation is not dependent upon withdrawal from the quotidian life. But this does not necessarily mean that his freedom is the same as Buddhist nirvana.

The paper concludes that Krishnamurti can be seen grappling with questions that strongly echo Buddhist philosophy, but should not be seen as a modern repetition of Buddha. His teachings reframe the problem of suffering as a radical inquiry into psychological conditioning and direct perception. Buddha and Krishnamurti thus offer two related but distinct approaches to freedom, one based on a full path of liberation, the other on an immediate transformation of consciousness through awareness. Their comparison is not meant to erase their differences but to show the different ways the philosophical search for freedom can manifest itself in different historical and intellectual contexts.

References

1. Bodhi, B. (Trans.). (2000). *The connected discourses of the Buddha: A translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*. Wisdom Publications.
2. Gethin, R. (1998). *The foundations of Buddhism*. Oxford University Press.
3. Krishnamurti, J. (1964). *The first and last freedom*. Harper & Row.
4. Krishnamurti, J. (1967). *Freedom from the known*. Harper & Row.
5. Krishnamurti, J. (1970). *The flight of the eagle*. Harper & Row.
6. Krishnamurti, J. (1971). *The urgency of change*. Harper & Row.
7. Krishnamurti, J. (1976). *On relationship*. Krishnamurti Foundation of America.
8. Krishnamurti, J. (1992). *Commentaries on living: First series*. Krishnamurti Foundation India.
9. Krishnamurti, J. (1992). *The first and last freedom*. HarperCollins.
10. Ñāṇamoli, B., & Bodhi, B. (Trans.). (1995). *The middle length discourses of the Buddha: A new translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Wisdom Publications.
11. Rahula, W. (1974). *What the Buddha taught* (2nd ed.). Grove Press.
12. Siderits, M. (2007). *Buddhism as philosophy: An introduction*. Hackett Publishing Company.
13. Walshe, M. (Trans.). (1987). *The long discourses of the Buddha: A translation of the Dīgha Nikāya*. Wisdom Publications.